REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 354 24
ACHIEVEMENT AND ROLE DEFINITION OF THE COLLEGE STUDENT.
BY- BAUR, E. JACKSON
KANSAS UNIV., LAWRENCE
REPORT NUMBER CRP-2605 PUB DATE 65
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0880
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$4.84 121P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COLLEGE ROLE, *COLLEGE STUDENTS, *PEER GROUPS, SOCIAL INFLUENCES, ROLE PLAYING, SOCIAL STRUCTURE, *ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SELF CONCEPT, *COCURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, LAWRENCE, KANSAS

A SOCIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT-COLLEGE INTERACTIONS WAS UNDERTAKEN WITH INTEREST CENTERED ON SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS AND ATTITUDES. STUDY OBJECTIVES WERE TO (1) IDENTIFY THE SALIENT ROLES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS, THE SETTINGS IN WHICH THESE ROLES ARE PERFORMED, AND THE ROLES OF OTHER PERSONS WITH WHOM THE ACTION IS CARRIED OUT, (2) DESCRIBE AND EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENT MODES OF ADAPTATION TO ROLE EXPECTATIONS, INCLUDING STUDENTS' SELF-CONCEPTS IN THEIR RELATIONS WITH OTHERS, AND (3) RELATE THESE ROLE CONCEPTIONS TO PATTERNS OF ATTITUDE AND CONDUCT, ESPECIALLY AS THEY ARE SHOWN IN SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT. PRIMARY DATA WERE GATHERED BY SELECTING A SAMPLE OF ENTERING FRESHMEN FROM ONE UNIVERSITY AND FOLLOWING THEIR INDIVIDUAL PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS THROUGH 4 YEARS OF UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLING. TECHNIQUES USED DURING THIS PERIOD WERE PERSONAL INTERVIEWS, PREPARED AUTOBIOGRAPHIES, AND PARTICIPANT-OBSERVER REPORTS. VARIOUS METHODS WERE EMPLOYED IN THE ANALYSES OF COLLECTED DATA. ASPECTS WERE DISCUSSED (AND CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS DENOTED) WITH RESPECT TO THE FOLLOWING VARIABLES--(1) STUDENT-SCHOOL STRUCTURE INTERACTIONS, (2) STUDENT RESIDENCE ASSOCIATIONS AND ACTIVITIES IN CAMPUS SOCIETY, (3) STUDENT RELATIONS WITH PEERS, TEACHERS, ADVISERS, AND PARENTS, AND (4) CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE AND ATTITUDES, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT. PARTICULAR ATTENTION WAS GIVEN TO COMPARISONS BETWEEN HONOR AND REGULAR STUDENTS. (JH)

ACHIEVEMENT AND ROLE DEFINITION OF THE COLLEGE STUDENT

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Cooperative Research Project No. 2605

E. JACKSON BAUR

Department of Sociology
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

1965

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ED 003354

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study depended on the encouragement, support, and talents of many people during the six years it required for completion. For the suggestion out of which it grew, and for his subsequent encouragement, I am indebted to the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences of the state university where the field work was conducted.

Financial support during the data collection phase was provided from the General Research funds of the University of Kansas, and from the research fund of its Graduate School. The facilities of the Computation Center of the University of Kansas were indispensible for the statistical analysis. A grant to begin the analysis was given by the Kansas City Association of Trusts and Foundations. The substantial support needed during the final year to complete the analysis and write this report was provided by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The help of these agencies is fully appreciated.

About seventy students worked on the project in various capacities as interviewers, field workers, analysts, coders, statisticians, programmers, and typists. Those whose contributions were especially noteworthy were Linda G. Waddington, David H. Klassen, Arthur M. Harkins, Sue Worley, Cynthia Gallup, Nancy Halbgewachs, Lois Miller, Linda Nelson, David E. Sutherland, Richart M. Barnes, Jane Crow, David Ontjes, Rahim Ola Ojikutu, Angie Magnusson, William B. Devall, Patricia Beers, Susan Gaskins, Merlyn Matthews, and Jeanne Sebaugh. Finally, I am greatly in debt to the students who responded to our questions.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1
Problem 1
Related Research 2
Selected Reports of Sociological Research on College Students in the United States 3
Concepts 3
Objectives 5
Design of the Research 5
Techniques of Data Gathering 6
Coding 7
The Sample 8
Analysis and Presentation. 8
II. STUDENT LIFE AT STATE UNIVERSITY 10
The University and the Student Body. 10
Student Background 10
Student Turnover 10
The Organization and Curricula of the University 11
Residential Units. 12
Student Organizations. 13
Student Groups and Factions. 13
Values and Social Types. 14
Dating 15
Students and Their Parents 16
Interpretation 17
III. THE CLASSROOM ROLE AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH PROFESSORS 19
Attitudes Toward Professors. 19
Attitudes of Professors. 21
Conclusion 24
IV. THE ADVISEE ROLE AND RELATIONS WITH ADVISORS 25
Freshmen and Sophomores. 25
Upperclassmen. 27
Conclusions. 28
V. STUDYING: DIMENSIONS AND MOTIVES. 29
Dimensions 29
Stages of Studying 31
Motivation 31
Rules and Standards. 34
Conclusion 36
VI. PROBLEMS OF STUDYING 37
Volume of Work 37
Competition for Study Time 38
Physical and Emotional Sickness. 39
Conclusion 42
VII. COPING WITH PROBLEMS OF STUDYING 43
Time and Place 43
Methods of Studying. 45
Self-Discipline. 45
Enrollment Manipulation. 46
Beating the System 47
Cheating 49
Conclusion 50

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII. CLASSMATE INFLUENCES ON STUDYING 52
  Co-operation 54
  Collective Action. 55
  Restriction of Output. 56
  Control of Professors. 59
  Conclusion 60
IX. THE HONOR STUDENT. 61
  The Advisee Role 61
  The Classroom Role 65
  The Role of Research Assistant 71
  The Public Role. 75
  Peer Role. 78
  Conclusion 81
X. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 82
  APPENDIX 85
    A. Schedules 85
    B. Coding Instructions, Reliability, and Distribution of Responses 97
    C. Tables. 110

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. Sample Size, Interviews Completed, and Completion Rate, by Semesters 110
2. Percent of Panel Sample (Weighted) Enrolled by Semesters, by Honor or Regular, and Sex 110
3. Status Among Students and Membership in Greek-Letter Societies, Percent 111
4. Alienation and Attachment Toward the Greek System by Membership in Greek-Letter Societies, Percent. 111
5. "Senior Slump": Last Semester Grade-Point Average in Relation to That of Semester Before the Last of Graduates in Sample, Percent 111
6. Perception of Freshman-Sophomore Advisor as a Person by Honor and Regular Students, Percent 112
7. Perception of Freshman-Sophomore Advisor's Knowledge of Courses and Requirements, Percent 112
8. Reaction to Academic Aspect of the Freshman Year by Honor and Regular Students, Percent. 112
9. Level of Academic Effort by Honor and Regular Students, Percent. 113
10. Satisfaction With Grades by Honor and Regular Students, Percent. 113
11. Value of Scholarship by Honor and Regular Students, Percent. 113

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem

The research here reported was begun in the spring of 1958 following a conversation with the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences of a large state university, in which he expressed interest in evaluating the recently instituted honors program for freshmen and sophomore students. Knowing the pitfalls of research on the effectiveness of action programs, I proposed rather to examine the honors program in the context of student life, and from the student's point of view. Exploration of a new field of inquiry, such as the sociology of student life in large universities, needs to begin at the concrete level of human experience, with how students see the university, what they think of it, how they feel about it, and what they believe its effects are on themselves. Only on the basis of such concrete case material can one develop valid abstract conceptual models of wider application.

When I began systematically collecting data from students I was amazed at the disparity between my notions of what students were like and their college experiences as they revealed them to me. What we outsiders know of student life is fragmentary and distorted by the particular role or perspective that brings us in touch with students. We see what we want or fear to see and they reveal what they want us to know. Not only is there faulty communication between students and adult educators and behavioral scientists, but students at a university do not know one another outside a limited circle of acquaintances. Though, at some small colleges, they may all know one another at least by sight, most of the students at a big university are strangers to one another. The typical collegian knows only those who participate with him in a few social circles. The student body as a whole is too large and complex for him to understand in any but the most superficial and fragmentary way.

I took this sociographic approach to the problem out of the conviction that in an area of investigation about which little is known, an exploratory, descriptive study was needed to broaden the scope of inquiry, and lay the groundwork for more rigorous research. Too many studies of students have been done by applying sophisticated methods of investigation on the basis of preconceptions about college life before adequately understanding its nature.

> There is widespread concern, for example, about the relation of the educational process to its end product, the graduate. But the efforts of administrators and teachers to improve the process and quality of the experience has been conceived on far too narrow a base. They have been concerned with some aspects which research might well show to be trivial--such as class size and teaching techniques. The failure may be partly attributed to the absence of research which demonstrates the significance between the total social environment, its relation to the learning process, and the inherent qualities of the student body enrolled in our educational institutions.*

The scope of this study can be specified in several ways. As a sociological study it is concerned with social and cultural factors, including those internalized by persons in the form of attitudes, and it is not concerned with psychological variables. Campus life is approached only from the point of view of its students, and not that of other university personnel. The study is limited to undergraduate students, excludes graduate students, and those in professional schools requiring a bachelor's degree for admission. Primary attention is given to students in the School of Letters and Sciences. Data were gathered only from students in residence, and no attempt was made to reach those who had left the University.

---

*Solon T. Kimball, "Social Science Research and Higher Education," Human Organization 21 (Winter, 1962-63), 271.

To implement the proposal I instituted a seminar and applied for financial support. From four to ten students participated in the seminar each year for five years. The members of the seminar explored the relevant social science literature, made participant observer studies of student life, wrote personal histories of their own college experience, and, most important of all, interviewed other students. Annual research grants made it possible to hire a graduate student to assist the director, and one or two other advanced students experienced in field research.

The seminar examined the literature of social science for answers to three basic questions. (1) What was known about student life? (2) What concepts could be used to guide our inquiry? And, (3) what methods of research should be used to gather and analyze data about student life? We early concluded that not very much was known about students from a sociological point of view. It is true, they had been frequently studied, but usually for the purpose of finding out their attitudes toward war, their religiosity, or their mating proclivities, but seldom for the purpose of finding out what it was like to be a student. We considered the applicability of many of the basic concepts of sociology before finally settling on role and act as the central concepts in our analytic framework. Within the first year we decided to tap a variety of data sources by using personal histories, interviews, participant observation, and data from University documents and files.

Related Research

No sociological study of the student body of a large American state university has been published since Angell's pioneering investigation in the '20s of Michigan's campus (1).* Recently, important sociological studies have been done on medical students (2, 7). The study by Hughes and his associates of the University of Kansas School of Medicine is similar to this one in its objectives and conceptualization, but differs in field work techniques. They used participant observation by professional social scientists while we depended primarily on a sample survey using student interviewers, and a collection of personal documents. A sociological study has been made of the impact of the student body on the functioning of a junior college (3). The reports on women's colleges (8, 9, 13) give primary attention to personality changes. Sample questionnaire surveys of national scope that deal with problems related to the scholastic side of college experience have been done by the Cornell Values Study (6, 12) and the National Opinion Research Center (4, 5). Several papers proposing research on student peer groups and subcultures, or reporting preliminary findings, have been published (10, 15, 16). The case histories of four students from different schools have been perceptively analyzed in sociological and social-psychological terms (11). The influence of fraternities and sororities at the University of Colorado on the values of their members, including that of academic achievement has been thoroughly studied (14).

Although valuable work has been done on certain aspects and special kinds of higher education, the above review supports Kimball's conclusion that:

---

*Works cited are listed at the end of this section.

> the sociological aspects of learning in any type of situation, especially higher education, have been largely neglected. The recently developed fields of communication, decision-making, and small group behavior have especial pertinence to the problem. But I know of no study which has made a systematic examination of the social behavior in the classroom, of the relation between the "climate" of student or faculty and attitudes toward learning, of the relation between formal and informal student groupings and academic achievement (as a measure of learning) or of the relation of any of these to academic excellence and real learning. . . . *

Selected Reports of Sociological Research on College Students in the United States

1. Angell, Robert C. The Campus. New York: Appleton, 1928.
2. Becker, Howard S., Blanche Geer, Everett C. Hughes and Anselm L. Strauss. Boys In White: Student Culture in Medical School. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
3. Clark, Burton. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
4. Davis, James A. Great Aspirations: The Graduate School Plans of America's College Seniors. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1964.
5. Davis, James A. Undergraduate Career Decisions: Correlates of Occupational Choice. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
6. Goldsen, Rose K., Morris Rosenberg, Robin M. Williams, Jr. and Edward A. Suchman. What College Students Think. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1960.
7. Merton, Robert K., G. G. Reader and P. L. Kendall. The Student Physician. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957.
8. Murphy, Lois B. and Esther Raushenbush (eds.). Achievement in the College Years: A Record of Intellectual and Personal Growth. New York: Harper, 1960.
9. Newcomb, Theodore M. Personality and Social Change. New York: Dryden, 1943.
10. Newcomb, Theodore M. "Student Peer-Group Influence," in The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning. Edited by Nevitt Sanford. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962. Pp. 469-488.
11. Raushenbush, Esther. The Student and His Studies. Middletown, Conneticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1964.
12. Rosenberg, Morris, Edward A. Suchman and Rose Goldsen. Occupations and Values. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.
13. Sanford, Nevitt et al., "Personality Development During the College Years," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 12 (1956), No. 4.
14. Scott, William A. Values and Organizations: A Study of Fraternities and Sororities. Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1965.
15. Trow, Martin, "Student Cultures and Administrative Action," in Personality Factors on the College Campus. Edited by Robert L. Sutherland et al. Austin, Texas: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1962. Chap. 10.
16. Tyler, Ralph W. et al. The Study of Campus Cultures: The Papers Presented at the Fourth Annual Institute on College Self-Study, University of California, Berkeley, July 24-27, 1962. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, February, 1963.

Concepts

The concepts I found most fruitful for analyzing student's experiences are those of action and role theory. From this perspective students' academic careers can be seen as composed of a series of acts toward long and short range goals. To complete these acts the student must perform a number of different roles that involve him in social situations with others. Successful completion of the act depends not

---

*Ibid., p. 275.

only on his ability to learn the role and cope with these situations, but also on his further socialization and self-development. This approach is derived from theories originally formulated by George H. Mead and developed by Ellsworth Faris, Everett C. Hughes, Theodore R. Sarbin, Daniel J. Levinson, Erving Goffman, Howard S. Becker, and others.

The college career is seen as a long-range act that involves the student in a series of encounters within various social situations. The roles he takes and his type of adjustment to the role affect his performance.* The process is complicated by the interconnection and overlapping of social situations so that the role taken in one situation is influenced by the others. The different roles may complement, reinforce or interfere with one another, and, if role conflict blocks movement toward his goal, the individual attempts to cope with the problem, individually or collectively. It is the nature of the human situation that action entails problems and poses dilemmas for which there are no easy solutions. The culture provides answers, but the actor may have to choose among them, while considering consequences that may be obscure or ambiguous. Furthermore, he is far from a free agent in making these choices and adjustments. The groups to which he belongs, or aspires, present him with role models and sanction his choices and the quality of his performance with reactions of approval or disapproval.** To the extent that different groups have conflicting expectations, his difficulties are compounded.

The capacity to cope with the problems of goal achievement and conflicting demands depends on a strong and integrated development of the self. The social self is part of the personality that guides action in social situations, and this function is accounted for, in role theory, by the internalization of the constellation of roles involved in social situations. The social self of a normal person is an organized system of internalized roles.*** Problematic and conflicting situations set up stress within the self and threaten or disturb the person's conception of himself. One aspect of his coping response is that of redefining his conception of himself. Alternative types of adaptation to role expectations are provided by the examples of others in the situation. He may copy one of the current social types or work out an idiosyncratic adaptation. His redefined self-conception influences his subsequent action.

In terms of this conceptual model, scholastic achievement can be examined as a consequence of successful role performance. Achievement depends, not only on efficient learning, but also on managing the conflicting social pressures and exploiting situational opportunities. Crucial to his performance is the actor's definition of himself that emerges out of his interaction with others.

---

*The definition of "role" used here is that of ". . . the structurally given demands (norms, expectations, taboos, responsibilities, and the like) associated with a given social position. Role is, in this sense, something outside the given individual, a set of pressures and facilitations that channel, guide, impede, support his functioning in the organization." In this sense, role is differentiated from the conception of a role held by its occupant, and from the actions of the individual performing the role. (Daniel J. Levinson, "Role, Personality, and Social Structure in the Organization Setting," in Sociology: The Progress of a Decade, A Collection of Articles. Edited by Seymour Martin Lipset and Neil J. Smelser [Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961], p. 302. Reprinted from Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 58 [1959], pp. 170-180).

**Robert W. White, Lives in Progress: A Study of the Natural Growth of Personality (New York: Dryden, 1952), p. 119.

***A. R. Mangus, "Role Theory and Marriage Counseling," Social Forces 35 (March, 1957), 203-204.

Objectives

The objectives of this study are, first, to identify the salient roles of college students, the settings in which these roles are performed, and the roles of other persons with whom the action is carried out; second, to describe and explain the different modes of adaptation to role expectations, including conceptions of themselves in their relations with others; and, third, to relate these role conceptions to patterns of attitude and conduct, especially as they are manifested in scholastic achievement.

Among the different situations and roles under scrutiny, those of students in the honors program are of special interest. We want to know what difference this particular role makes in their intellectual development.

Design of the Research

This research fits the pattern of a community study more than any other form of sociological investigation. Like a report on a community, it is essentially a case study of a single entity--in this instance the undergraduate student body. And, as in the case of a community study, the population of persons and groups is sufficiently diverse to permit internal comparisons. Differences and variations in characteristics can be categorized and measured so that statistical methods can be applied. The research was given time depth by following a student cohort through four years of undergraduate work.

The size of the student body, numbering many thousands, made it necessary for us to use the methods of the sample, interview survey. Since it was important for our purpose to compare honor and regular students, we used a stratified, random sample with an oversampling of honor students. The influence of the honor student stratum was brought into its proper proportion by applying a weighting factor. The members of the sample were interviewed several times during their college careers. Technically speaking, we used a random, stratified, panel sample.

As is so often desirable with case studies, its actual identity is disguised. The school is referred to simply as State University or S. U. Furthermore, all proper names and all other identifying terms, whenever possible, have been changed. Several reasons can be stated for concealing the true identity of the University. First, all informants were assured of the fullest possible anonymity. Second, the University is undergoing rapid change in many respects, so that a report based on data gathered in the past misrepresents the present situation. Third, the picture of the University is biased in the sense that it is depicted from the point of view of its students, and not of its faculty, administrators, employees, or alumni. Since each of these categories of persons sees the University from his own perspective, and in the light of his own experience, there can be no single objective image of the University. Fourth, statistics derived from a sample of 116 informants are necessarily subject to a large margin of sampling variability and inferences derived from these data are subject to some error. Fifth, and, perhaps most important from a methodological point of view, the disguise increases my objectivity. Since my research findings do not always support the favorable public image that the University takes great pains to foster, by concealing its identity I feel less compunction about reporting my findings. There are other reasons for anonymity that cannot be stated because they would tend to identify the University.

Techniques of Data Gathering

The members of the seminar assisted the project director in developing the instruments for gathering data as well as doing the actual field work. Our most important source of information came from a series of focused interviews with a sample of students during their undergraduate enrollment. The interview schedules were criticized, pretested, and revised in the research seminar, and, before they were used in the field, the seminar members were trained in the techniques of interviewing by the project director. The schedules are reprinted in Appendix A.

Six interviews were held at intervals between the fall of 1959 and the spring of 1963 with each student who could be contacted. Interviews were held late in each semester, except in the academic year 1961-62 when field work was suspended during my absence from the campus. This would normally have been the junior year for the members of our sample. We attempted to cover the events of that year in the fifth interview held in the fall of 1962. The first interview, held in the fall of 1959, emphasized the new freshman's high school background, his first impressions of the University, and the adjustment problems he encountered. In each interview questions were asked about the important areas of student experience--academic, residential, organized activities, social life, and relations with their families. In the following spring, the second interview obtained more complete information on the informant's family and community background. The last interview asked for reflections on certain important aspects of college education, and future plans and expectations.

The questions in the interviews were all of the free answer type and the interviewers were instructed to probe for a full response. In the beginning, the field workers were urged to frame the questions in their own words to maximize the informality and spontaneity of the interview situation. This is why the schedule for the first interview is simply an outline of topics for questioning. After experience with the first interview, however, the field workers agreed that they preferred to work from a schedule composed of prepared questions(see Appendix A).

Most of the interviews were held in offices or small rooms in a University building. Almost all the others took place in informants' living quarters. With few exceptions, the interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The others were written up from notes. Typically each interview lasted for about one hour, though they ranged from a few minutes to more than two hours.

Autobiographies* of college careers were obtained from 180 students. These were written by members of certain introductory sociology classes from the fall of 1958 through spring, 1961, as well as by all of the seminar participants. The writing of an autobiography was a required assignment. To aid in its preparation, students were given an outline to follow and questions to answer (see Appendix A).

Although the students in these classes could in no sense be considered a representative sample, they did have varied backgrounds. Since Introduction to Sociology is a course that fulfills requirements in several different schools and departments, it enrolls a wide range of undergraduate students. Although it is an elementary course, enrollment is not confined to freshmen and sophomores. In fact, two-thirds of the writers of autobiographies were juniors and seniors.

---

*Technically speaking, these documents could be called "biograms" as suggested by Theodore Abel who defined this research instrument and distinguished it from the literary autobiography and psychological life history. See "The Nature and Use of Biograms," American Journal of Sociology 53 (September, 1947), 11-118.

The decision to obtain information by means of personal histories was made with the expectation that they would serve an exploratory function, provide a more knowledgable basis for drafting the interview schedules, and might also add some instances of variant experiences not reported by members of the sample. However, when we compared the content of the autobiographies with that of the interviews we found that these privately written reports often revealed more richness and intimacy of detail than the interviews. The preparation of a written report may also have given students more of an opportunity for thoughtful reflection and detailed presentation than was possible in the interview situation. They may also have felt less hesitation to reveal themselves in a document that would be read only by the professor and his research assistants, than in a face-to-face encounter with a fellow student. Although the student interviewers varied in their proficiency, their work, with a few exceptions, was satisfactory and had the merit of more systematic coverage than was possible in the written stories.

For the purpose of gaining some insight into the social context of student life, each member of the seminar conducted a study of some student group, category, or situation. The kinds of groups on which they reported included members of an organization, residents of a dormitory floor, a fraternity pledge class, habitués of a "hangout," a professional society, the staff of a publication, and the cast of a theatrical production. Categories and situations were such things as married women students, varsity athletes, honor students, and pre-medical students. Observation was supplemented in several instances with interviewing, and the use of questionnaires and tests. An objective of each study was to relate the experience of the students involved in the group or situation to their academic development and achievement. About thirty-five of these studies were completed. Some were carried out in collaboration with another member of the seminar.

One of the first tasks of the seminar was to identify and locate every possible kind of recorded and published information about individual students. Among the sources that were especially valuable were the permanent academic record maintained by the Registrar, the profile of placement examination scores, registration form, admission application, commencement program, student directory, and the yearbook. Data from these sources, and some others, were obtained for all of the students in the random sample.

Coding

Numerical codes for punched-card analysis were assigned to many of the variable characteristics of the panel sample (see Appendix B). Nineteen variables (numbers 1-19) were coded on the basis of recorded data, with some adjustments for supplementary information from the interviews. Thirty-five variables (numbers 20-54) were coded by content analysis of the interviews.

Explicit coding instructions were written for all variables (see Appendix B). Since the coding of the recorded information left little leeway for individual judgment it posed no problem of coder reliability. On the other hand, the variables coded on the basis of the interviews depended on the coder's ability to synthesize and classify information from the interviews. The work was done by five coders. Each informant was coded by at least two different coders, and ten of them by all five coders. Thus we could measure the percent of agreement between coders and compute a more precise measure of reliability--the index of intercoder agreement or pi.* The use of a computor made it possible to calculate these measures for each of seven pairings of the five coders on all thirty-five variables. We then used the computor to select the coding on each variable of those coders who had the highest reliability. (For percent agreement, pi, and the number of persons coded at each level, see Appendix B.)

The Sample

We drew the sample from the class of freshmen who entered the University in the fall of 1959. Our source was a set of the punched cards for the students who enrolled and paid their fees. The size of the sample was limited by the number of students in my seminar who were to do the interviewing. I estimated that the nine of them could handle a sample of about 100. Since we wanted to compare honor students with the others, we first sorted out the ninety-three students whom the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences had invited to participate in the honors program. Since each student at S. U. is given a serial number, that was also punched into this card, the sample was easily drawn by using terminal digits. We decided that we needed twenty honor students. To yield this many required taking three digits from a table of random numbers and selecting persons by the one's digit of their serial number. Similarly, the stratum of regular students was drawn by taking seven two-digit random numbers, and drawing individuals whose serial numbers ended in these numbers. The operation produced a subsample of ninety-six. We expected the total number of 116 names to shrink by about 15 percent from drop-outs and refusals. We actually obtained the first interview from 109 students for a 94 percent completion rate (for sample size and completion rate by semesters, see Appendix C, Table 1).

Since we drew a random sample of the freshman class it was assumed to be representative within sampling error limits (at the 5 percent probability level) of not more than 10 percent, plus or minus. However, with each subsequent year, the sample became decreasingly representative of the students at that level of their education, i.e. it was less representative of sophomores, and least representative of seniors. There were at least three reasons for this: some students withdrew from the University, new students entered after having studied at other colleges and universities, and some students didn't keep pace with the normal rate of academic progression. Our sample, therefore, was not representative of the student body, nor even of the class of '63; it was representative simply of the surviving members of the cohort of freshmen who first enrolled at S. U. in the fall of 1959. After four years of studying, a little more than half of them (55 percent) were still enrolled (see Appendix C, Table 2).

Analysis and Presentation

Primary data from interviews, autobiographies, and participant-observer reports was extracted and classified by the salient roles of college students. The latter included the roles of scholar, advisee, classmate, vocational career, resident of a dormitory or house, member of a student organization, peer, partner in dating and marriage, and adolescent in his family and community. Within each role, material was analyzed in terms of role conceptions, social relationships, settings, and actions.

Wherever patterns, types, and sequences could be discerned, the findings are supported by examples from primary data. Quotations are used to illustrate typical experiences and the range of variation in student reactions. Pertinent statistics are presented in the text and references are made to tables in the appendixes.

Since the focus of interest in this study is academic achievement, detailed

---

*William A. Scott, "Reliability of Content Analysis: The Case of Nominal Scale Coding," Public Opinion Quarterly 19 (Fall, 1955), 321-325.

attention is given the various aspects of the scholar role. The findings, however, are preceded by a general introduction to student life at S. U. in which all of the major roles are briefly described. The scholar role is first analyzed in terms of the classroom setting and students' relations with professors. This is followed by consideration of student contact with professors in the roles of advisor and advisee. The act of studying is next examined in terms of its dimensions, settings, and obstacles. Chapters are devoted to the ways students cope with problems of studying, to the influence of their peers, and the effect of student subculture on studying. The body of the report is concluded with an analysis of the different facets of the honor student role in which comparisons are made with regular students.

CHAPTER II

STUDENT LIFE AT STATE UNIVERSITY

The University and the Student Body

State University is a co-educational institution located in a college town not far from a large city. It is the biggest and most respected university in the state. Within the University are the usual schools for professional and graduate training of which the largest are the School of Graduate Studies, Engineering, Education, Medicine, Fine Arts, and Business. The largest single unit is the School of Letters and Sciences for undergraduate, general education.

Of the several thousand students enrolled at the time our research began, about two-thirds were undergraduates and also about two-thirds were residents of the State. Among the undergraduates two-thirds were men, and 15 percent of all students were married. One-third of the entering freshmen graduated from the five largest high schools within the state, all but one of which was located in a metropolitan area. Four-fifths of the freshmen ranked in the upper half of their graduating class, and one-fourth ranked in the upper tenth.*

Student Background

For most students, attending the University was an exciting experience, sometimes trying, and occasionally gratifying. It was about the biggest thing that had happened to them up to that point in their lives. Entrance into the University was an event long anticipated by most students, for it had been planned for by their parents and themselves for as long as they could remember. This attitude was characteristic of those from middle-class backgrounds. Students who had only recently decided to go to college, often at the urging of someone outside the family, such as a high school teacher, were more likely to have a working-class background.

S. U. undergraduates were predominantly from middle-class homes. Less than 10 percent of our sample, as judged by the occupations of their fathers, had working or lower-class backgrounds (see Appendix B, Table 20). Only 7 percent of their fathers had no more than an elementary education, while 29 percent were college graduates (see Appendix B, Table 5). Going to college was part of their middle-class pattern of living. If the student wasn't already from this stratum he planned to get there. Forty percent of the students in our sample aspired to higher professional and big executive positions (see Appendix B, Table 52), though only 23 percent of their fathers were so employed. From the sociologist's point of view it appeared that a substantial number of students were attending the University to maintain their middle-class station or to lay claim to middle or upper-class status.

Student Turnover

About one-fourth of the freshmen who entered the University in the fall of 1959 failed to re-enroll for the sophomore year. They were in large part replaced by persons transferring from other schools. In the junior year the influx substantially exceeded the withdrawals. The net effect of students leaving and advanced students coming in was to keep the class of '63 at about the same size through the four years of its existence. In the sample we drew from the freshmen who entered in the fall of

---

*Statistics in this paragraph are from reports and public statements of the Registrar.

1959, 71 percent enrolled at S. U. a year later, and 54 percent were enrolled in the spring of 1963 when most of them would normally have completed their undergraduate work (see Appendix C, Table 2). Hence, about half of the cohort survived to complete the undergraduate academic program in the prescribed time, and they were replaced by about an equal number who had taken part of their work at other institutions of higher education. Thus there was a constant loss of participants, and intermittent introduction of strangers into the student body--a condition that interfered with the establishment of stable social groups.

Most of the students who withdrew from the University between 1959 and 1963 had failed to meet minimum scholastic standards. In the sample, 21 percent were dropped for poor scholarship by action of the faculty between 1959 and 1963. Twenty-eight percent withdrew voluntarily for a multitude of unknown reasons, of which poor scholarship was no doubt one, for most of these drop-outs had been placed on academic probation for one or more semesters. Only about 13 percent were known to have withdrawn from S. U. while in good standing and transferred to another school, or considered transferring, as indicated by their request that a transcript of their academic record be sent to another college or university. Some of those who had withdrawn or been dropped (about 16 percent) had returned to the University by the spring of 1963.

The Organization and Curricula of the University

The formal organization and curricula of the University resembled those of most other state universities. And, like the others, the School of Letters and Sciences occupied a central position. Its students comprised a third of the total enrollment. Most of the professional schools required undergraduate work in the School of Letters and Sciences as a requirement for admission. Only two schools--Engineering and Fine Arts--and the program in physical education enrolled freshmen. The other schools required either two or four years of undergraduate preparation in the School of Letters and Sciences. As a consequence three-fourths of all freshmen and sophomores were enrolled in L. and S.

The curriculum of the School of Letters and Sciences prescribed certain courses or kinds of courses either because they provided training in basic skills or were considered essential for a liberal education. Much of the lower division years were taken up with these courses. On attaining junior standing the student was formally admitted to a department where he completed requirements for specialization in the subject of his major interest. However, the student may have already taken courses in this department, and he considered himself to be majoring in that department from the time he made his choice. For upper division students the departments were the important units of academic administration. There were about twenty-five of them, as well as about ten more major programs administered by inter-departmental committees.

Stereotyped images of the students in different schools and departments were current on the campus. Departments like physics and mathematics, whose courses were reputed to be "hard," had high prestige, while business for men, and elementary education for women, had low rank. Some, like drama students were believed to be "different" without any invidious connotation. The prestige of the same fields, in the context of the future careers their students were pursuing, often differed from their prestige on the campus. All of the traditional professions, including engineering, along with future physical scientists and business men were highly regarded. Low status was given to nursing, all of the arts, and physical education. These were either traditionally feminine careers or believed to lack intellectual content. Other fields fell into a middle category or were not clearly ranked.*

General criteria of status among students, that cut across the schools and departments, were measures of their academic progress and success. So obvious to students that it was seldom mentioned in talk about status, was the ranking by years of attendance as freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. However, seniority was not so important that underclassmen were not elected to positions of leadership. Cutting across these divisions, was ranking by grades as measured by the grade-point average (computed by converting letter grades to numerical scores). The higher the g.p.a. the greater the prestige. There was no such thing as a gentleman's C at S. U.; however, one should not have appeared to work too hard to get high grades.

Residential Units

For students, the most important social units outside the academic system of the University were their residential quarters. Except for rented rooms or apartments, students referred to their quarters as "living groups," and those with elected officers, whether houses of Greek-letter societies or dormitories, were called "organized houses." The largest number of students (40 percent of our sample) lived in college owned dormitories. Thirty percent lived in fraternity and sorority houses, and the remaining thirty percent lived in a variety of privately owned accommodations, including 19 percent in apartment houses, four percent in rooming houses, and eight percent who lived at home (see Appendix B, Table 32). University dormitories were of two distinctly different kinds: large buildings for the general student and small "scholar residences" for able students with limited financial resources. Freshman girls, unlike the boys, were required to live in dormitories, and could not pledge to join a sorority until the second semester.

Students were identified more by their living group than any other characteristic. One student was usually introduced to another as "Bob Brown, a Phi Ep," or "Jane Smith from Weston." Where a student lived had more to do with his impersonal prestige rating among his peers than any other factor. The highest status was accorded those who were members of highly rated fraternities and sororities. About one-fifth of the Greek-letter societies were in this elite position. A second level of prestige was occupied by the middle ranked Greek houses, comprising about one-third of all the chapters. A third stratum contained the low ranking Greek organizations and the scholar residences. Dormitories were fourth in residential standing, and rooming houses were lowest. Apartments were not attributed any distinct status position.

The prestige of the houses and the grades earned by their members were closely correlated. Each semester the Registrar released a scholarship report in which all of the groups and categories of students were ranked by their grade-point averages. The figures and rankings were published in the town and student newspapers, and were avidly read by students in the same spirit that a baseball fan follows the "standing of the clubs." Bright high school pupils were eagerly "rushed" to bring up the house average.

Though the grade-point average was an important sign of living group prestige, there were other contributing factors, academic as well as extracurricular. Combining both elements was the number of members elected to class honorary societies. There was a society each for men and women sophomores, juniors, and seniors. The number and importance of leadership positions in campus organizations was another guage of living group status. The lavishness and novelty of parties given by organized houses added to their prestige. Houses and dormitories engaged in institutionalized competition with one another for such things as the best productions in the annual musical revue, house decorations for homecoming weekend, floats in an annual spring parade, intramural sports, and, for women's living groups, the number of queens elected from their

---

*From an unpublished report of a 1960 sample survey of 324 S. U. undergraduates.

membership. Hardly an extracurricular event occurred without the selection of a queen and attendants to preside over the focal rituals.

Student Organizations

A multitude of diverse kinds of formally organized groups existed on the campus. According to the 1963 Student Handbook, there were over 300 recognized organizations, exclusive of housing groups. The campus directory listed thirty-five honorary societies, thirteen student government bodies, fifteen campus publications, sixty-eight professional and departmental organizations, and twenty-seven religious groups. Membership, however, was very unequally distributed, i.e., a few students belonged to a great many, while most students belonged to very few. One-fourth of the students in our sample held two-thirds of the memberships, and two-fifths had no known organized activity. There was a striking difference between the members of Greek-letter societies and the independent students in the extent of participation in student organizations. In our panel, only 20 percent of the Independents were members of three or more organizations, compared with 61 percent of the Greeks. Fraternities and sororities encouraged, and in many cases required, their members to join and seek offices in organizations. It was through the control of organizations that the living groups wielded power in student affairs.

Organizations differed in their prestige among students. On a vertical scale they fell into about four prestige levels with the highest comprised of honorary societies, student government bodies and agencies, and varsity athletic teams. The second included professional societies, the Student Union board, publication staffs, and political clubs like the Young Republicans. The third level was composed of religious groups including church sponsored societies, the Y. M. C. A., etc. In the lowest stratum were the musical organizations, academic departmental clubs, and "pep" clubs. However, none detracted from a person's standing. Membership in even the lowliest of them added some increment of prestige to a student's reputation.

The prestige of an organization was largely determined by its exclusiveness. The higher ranking groups had limited memberships for which there was intense competition. Choice was made by secret selection or popular election. Most of the lower ranking groups were open to anyone who was interested. In all organizations a member could acquire additional prestige by attaining an office. Often this was not hard to do, if the member was willing to spend the time the position required. Most organizations were constantly searching for persons willing to assume responsibilities. Not infrequently groups suffered from having an officer who was reluctant to work. He wanted the symbol of status with a minimum of personal commitment.

The control of student governing bodies was contested by campus political parties which were coalitions of living groups largely dominated by the fraternities and sororities. The victorious parties were able to fill important posts with their members, and win the rewards of prestige, power, and also several remunerative posts.

Evidence for the dominance of Greeks over Independents in student affairs came from the analysis of our survey data in which we classified our informants as leaders, participants, and marginals. Although Greeks were 41 percent of the sample (see Appendix B, Table 31), 87 percent of all the leaders were Greeks, and only 10 percent of the marginals were fraternity or sorority members (see Appendix C, Table 3).

Student Groups and Factions

This complex structure, focused around the living groups and dominated by the Greek-letter societies was subjected to a constant barrage of criticism. It was accused of encouraging class snobbery, perpetuating racial discrimination, and misdirecting the energies of students into trivial pursuits. The criticism came from within their own membership as well as from Independents. Every year a few potential members broke their pledges, and a number of upperclassmen, who had enough of living with sixty to eighty brothers, moved to apartment houses. But these acts were merely overt manifestations of dissatisfaction. We obtained an expression of attitudes toward the Greek system in the interviews with our student panel. The division between the alienated and the attached was 42 and 59 percent, respectively. We classified their responses into four degrees of alienation. At the extremes, 4 percent were strongly alienated, while 18 percent were strongly attached (see Appendix B, Table 39).

The depth of the division of opinion was revealed by comparing the attitudes of Greeks and Independents toward the Greek system. Not one member of a fraternity or sorority in our sample was found to be alienated, while two-thirds of the Independents were so classified (see Appendix C, Table 4). This separation between Greeks and Independents was the most pervasive line of social distinction within the student body. Since, generally speaking, the Greeks dominated campus life, the distinction was more like that between haves and have-nots, than a split between rival factions. The attitudes of Independents toward Greeks was a mixture of envy and scorn. The realities of prestige and power could not be ignored, but the implied though unmistakable values of elitism and its unpleasant consequences in the form of exclusiveness and snobbery were emphatically rejected. Some of the more socially sensitive Greeks suffered from the conflict between the covert values of the Greek system and their belief in the American doctrine of equalitarianism.

In addition to the officially recognized organizations, there were many other unofficial and informal student groups. Some had names and officers while others were simply large cliques. They were usually not known outside of limited circles and, therefore, were not clearly ranked by prestige. Among them were secret political machines and subrosa drinking clubs that implemented the less reputable activities of fraternity men. Others harbored rebels against the Greek system as well as autonomous persons pursuing unconventional interests.

Friendships were formed mostly with persons sharing the same living quarters--roommates, dwellers on the same floor, or fraternity brothers. Some high school friendships, particularly among graduates of large schools, carried over into the freshman year, but usually faded after that unless they were reinforced by some common interest at the University. Some friendships were formed among members of the same campus organization. Durable association among classmates rarely developed unless they had several classes together, as sometimes happened with honor students, or those majoring in the same subject. Although nearly all students had friends on the campus, not all of them had close friends. In our sample, 15 percent had no close friends with other students (see Appendix B, Table 34). But this figure understates the proportion of social isolates in the student body because the sample did not include transfer students from other colleges and universities, who found it more difficult to make friends than those who enrolled as freshmen.

Values and Social Types

In student thinking, the antithesis of intellectual activity was participation in campus social life. Studying and "partying" were opposite terms. The typical answer to the question: What kinds of students are there at S. U.? was: "There are those who come here to study; and those who come to have fun." The polar social types were the "brains" and the "party boys." The importance of campus social life was implied in the common assertion that most of the coeds had come to college to acquire a husband. In our interviews, not a few men admitted that one of their reasons was to find a wife. The ideal undergraduate was the so-called "well-rounded student" who studied, made good grades, participated in student activities, and enjoyed the campus social life. No student was highly regarded by his fellows unless he achieved in both the academic and social spheres.

Contrasting with the well-rounded student was the varsity athlete. Thousands went to watch him perform, and he was applauded and respected for his accomplishments, but he was not popular in the sense of being sought after for personal association. The prevailing attitude toward the athletes as peers was implied in derogatory terms, such as "jocks" or "animals" commonly applied to them. Students who shared living quarters with them complained of their noise and horseplay. They were also looked down on because the physical education curriculum which many of them followed, was believed to make a minimum of intellectual demands on its students. Their low grade-point averages were a subject of gossip. In reaction to these attitudes of their peers, the sensitive athlete considered himself to be the forgotten man of the campus. He gave his all for the glory of alma mater, but no one appreciated his sacrifices. The athlete suffered from playing roles of conflicting value. He was publicly acclaimed for his talent in bringing public recognition to S. U., but he also had to act like a scholar and too often he fell short of respectable standards. He was typed as a hero in the stadium, and a dunce in the classroom.

Dating

Relationships between men and women were clearly defined along a courtship continuum from dating to marriage. The intermediate steps were those of going steady, being "lavaliered," "pinned," and engaged. The lavalier is a simple chain and fraternity letters, given to the girl. After being "pinned" the girl wears the boy's fraternity pin. The latter two practices and associated rituals were observed only by members of the Greek-letter societies. Each step along the continuum involved stronger commitment between the partners. Our panel of student informants was classified on the basis of the most recent information about them. We found that 8 percent were not dating, 20 percent dated occasionally, 40 percent dated regularly, 12 percent were going steady or were lavaliered, 6 percent were pinned, 8 percent engaged, and 9 percent married (see Appendix B, Table 49). Information on the extent of heterosexual involvement in the student body as a whole was available from other sources. The Registrar reported, in the fall of 1961, that 12 percent of all undergraduates were married. The range by class was from 3 percent of freshmen to 27 percent of seniors. In a random sample of 320 sophomores, juniors, and seniors, questioned in 1964, 17 percent were going steady or were lavaliered, 5 percent were pinned, 12 percent engaged, and 14 percent married.*

The etiquette of dating and courtship varied in degree of formality with different social circles and strata. Among the more class-conscious cliques of higher ranking Greeks, dating was far from a casual liaison. The boy and girl had to first meet under appropriate circumstances before he could ask her for a date. Boys were introduced to girls by mutual friends or fraternity brothers. The classroom was rarely a setting in which association led to dating and courtship. Although classmates of the same sex might become friendly, this did not happen between boys and girls unless the latter took the lead by making friendly overtures. However, a girl who was pinned or engaged could be friendly with boys in her classes because it was understood they would not ask her for a date. Joint participation in organized activities provided a more favorable setting than the classroom for heterosexual friendships. The unbalanced sex ratio of two males for every female among the undergraduates, apparently tended to increase distance and formality in the relationship between unattached men and women. Many girls could afford to be aloof. In circles of students less concerned about status and social reputation, relations between the sexes was not so constrained by rules of etiquette.

---

*From an unpublished report of a sample, interview survey.

Certain customs and institutions existed to bridge the sex gap at S. U. So-called "blind" dating was widely practiced. Usually it took the form of a couple inviting a boy and girl to accompany them on some social occasion. Another device for bringing people together was the "hour dance." A fraternity might invite all the members of a sorority to their house for a brief party, or the boys of a dormitory might invite the residents of a girls' dormitory. The hour dance functioned as a collective introduction. There were other occasions when university administrators or student organizations sponsored events intended primarily or secondarily to get students better acquainted with one another. The sociologically significant thing about all of these devices is that special measures had to be taken to provide favorable opportunities for boy-girl relationships. Merely bringing thousands of them together on one campus was not a sufficient condition for optimizing heterosexual association.

Dating usually involved going somewhere and doing something. In the town and its vicinity were several places for dancing, drinking, and eating that were popular with students. The local movie theaters were heavily patronized. Students sometimes drove to nearby Metroplis, especially on weekends, where there were more opportunities for commercial recreation. Planned social affairs were sponsored by living groups, and were usually held in their own buildi[illegible] though they sometimes went elsewhere for more informal barn dances, "woodsies," and sandbar parties. Drinking was prevalent in connection with most student social affairs, though possession and consumption of liquor violated the regulations of the Student Council.

Spectator events were another occasion for dating. The biggest audiences were drawn by intercollegiate athletic events, especially football and basketball. An annual musical revue, in which the prize winning numbers were produced by competing fraternities and sororities, filled the auditorium. Visiting jazz and popular vocal performers invariably attracted large audiences, but cultural events, including performances by famous artists and musical groups, aroused little interest. Performances by the drama students were also lightly attended by their fellows. Lectures by scholars and scientists, with the exception of such renouned figures as Aldous Huxley or Margaret Mead, aroused slight interest among the students.

Students and Their Parents

Although only 8 percent of the students in our sample lived at home while attending college, for most students, their families were a very real presence. Almost all were dependent on their parents for financial support, at least in part. Many students went home on weekends. Parents often visited their sons and daughters, especially on football Saturdays. Students who did not have their own cars were usually transported by their parents to and from home between semesters, and for the Christmas and Spring vacations. Between visits, contact was usually maintained by letters and phone calls.

More important than the visits and communication between students and their parents was the latter's influence. How students conducted themselves, especially in the academic sphere, was strongly affected by the attitudes of their parents, and to a lesser extent by other people in their home town. Parents influenced their reasons for going to college, their choice of major subject, the courses in which they enrolled, and how hard they worked on their studies. Children did not always comply with their parents' wishes, and in some cases their behavior was a reaction to parental pressure. Rejection of familial authority sometimes took the devious form of rebellion against the University. But, for most students, the hopes and ambitions of their mothers and fathers were essentially the same as their own.

From the student point of view, attendance at college was primarily for the purpose of self-development. In the last interview, when they had almost completed their undergraduate work, we asked the surviving members of our panel what had been most valuable to them during their years at S. U. Social development was most important for 64 percent. They spoke of learning to know, and getting along with, many different kinds of people, and the importance of the friendships they had made. One forthrightly said it was getting a spouse. Another aspect of social development was emphasized by the 4 percent who said they had achieved independence from their parents. Intellectual development was mentioned first by 23 percent. Occupational preparation was uppermost in the minds of only 9 percent.

The mere fact that social development was mentioned three times as often as intellectual development as their most valued experience does not mean that the majority of students had no scholarly interests. From a content analysis of the interviews with our panel, we judged that 60 percent had a scholarly attitude toward their studies. These were subdivided into 20 percent who had a strong scholarly orientation, found pleasure in their studies, and were not much concerned about their grades, and another 40 percent who got some pleasure from their school work or a great deal from a few subjects. Only 14 percent had no interest in the content of their courses and were motivated entirely by extrinsic considerations (see Appendix B, Table 41).

The impact of higher education is reflected in the evidence of change in scholarly interests. A majority (55 percent) showed evidence in their interviews of having changed from narrowly occupational aims to a genuine interest in education. It needs to be added that 10 percent were already broad in their interests when they entered the University (see Appendix B, Table 53).

Despite the stress involved in obtaining a University education, less than a fifth of the students in our sample (18 percent) were more alienated than attached to the institution, and, at the opposite pole more than a fourth of them (26 percent) were strongly attached to S. U. Fifty-six percent were moderately attached (see Appendix B, Table 38). Most students we talked to were proud of the University, and the seniors, with few exceptions, were satisfied that their purpose in going to college had been fully achieved.

Interpretation

Sociologically speaking, the structure of undergraduate student life at S. U. had an organized core in an unorganized mass. The members of national fraternities and sororities dominated student affairs through their control of extracurricular activities and their social prestige. The Independents formed a mass without overall structure and autonomous leadership. Some futilely aped the fraternities by attempting to organize their living groups, and by seeking a more active role in student affairs. But most of the Independents rejected or ignored the Greek system and found satisfaction in varied interests--their studies, pre-professional activities, and intellectual and social movements. A few failed to find satisfying associations and pursuits among their fellow students. As a structure the system lacked stability because the Independents, who formed a majority of the student body, were effectively excluded from full participation. In a sense, they were second class citizens of campus society.

Approaching student life from the cultural perspective, the values, which should have given coherence and direction to student life were weak and contradictory. Intellectual values were obscured by "making grades" and collective efforts to raise grade-point averages. Grades, which were supposed to function as a means for measuring learning and possibly as an inducement to study, tended to become an end in themselves. Most students overvalued this symbolic goal and tended to lose sight of the effective means for becoming educated. The grading system, imposed by the University and exploited by the organized houses, was at the basis of this confusion of means and ends.

The domination of undergraduate life by the Greek system made elitism prevail over equalitarianism. Despite explicit protestations to the contrary, and vigorous affirmations of democratic beliefs, fraternity and sorority members acted as though subtle distinctions of rank were more important than brotherhood. The concept of fraternity was particularistically applied to members of the in-group. One consequence was the collegiate dilemma of believing like democrats and acting aristocratically. The impotent Independents were reduced to imitative striving, futile protest, or withdrawing.

In conclusion, student life at S. U. was socially fragmented and culturally confused. In sociological terms, it was an anomic society. Students who succeeded in becoming educated did so inspite of the "system" rather than because of it. In fact, it was insufficiently integrated to be called a system.

CHAPTER III

THE CLASSROOM ROLE AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH PROFESSORS

Within the formal structure of American colleges and universities the central feature is the classroom in which students and professors come together. For both teacher and learner attending and meeting classes is the formal activity to which other functions of the institution are usually dependent. All other scholarly pursuits of the undergraduate student--study, research, and writing--are ancillary to the activities that go on in the classroom. By classroom, of course, I mean to encompass the lecture hall and laboratory--all of the places where students meet with a member of the faculty.

The classroom is the scene of the public performance of the educational drama. It is the stage on which the central characters enact the roles of learner and teacher. However, the two kinds of performers in this drama come from the wings with different levels of preparation. Usually the teacher is a professional who has been there before--so many times, in fact, that his performance has become somewhat routinized. While the student who first enters the university, on the other hand, comes to the stage unrehearsed. In fact, he hasn't even seen the scenario prior to going onstage. At this point the theatrical analogy breaks down additionally, because the professor not only performs the leading role, but he is also the dramatist and the director of the play.

Much of the data from our field study of students at State University can be effectively presented within the framework of the dramatic model. This chapter is concerned with the central social feature of education--the relationship between teacher and learner, presented from the latter's point of view.

The undergraduates at S. U. learned their classroom roles and formed their attitudes toward professors primarily through personal experience at the university itself. The roles they had learned as high school pupils for interacting with their teachers were different from and inadequate for dealing with college professors. A sophomore girl, who had been valedictorian in her graduating class of eight pupils, wrote:

> I was amazed at the lack of concern shown by my professors toward the fact that, in my opinion, I was practically flunking all my courses. . . . In high school it seems that I expected my teachers to be personally concerned about my grades, and they were. . . . In college I learned that everyone was pretty well expected to handle such things by himself.

On the other hand, a junior boy from a large metropolitan high school, wrote, "I found my teachers different from the concept that I had when I entered. Instead of impersonal lecturers, most of my teachers showed personal interests in their students. I came to like my teachers and courses very much during this first semester. . . ." The diversity of students' attitudes before enrolling in the university suggests that they came with divergent expectations and after enrolling they failed to assimilate a common conception of professorial conduct. In short we found no evidence of a pervasive student, subculture patterning attitudes toward professors.

Attitudes Toward Professors

The ordinary, entering freshman typically saw his role in relation to his professors as passive, helpless, and remote. But, after some direct experience in the role, these conceptions tended to change in the direction of their opposites, i.e., toward a role and relationship that was more active, competent, and close. The speed and the amount of change of this kind varied tremendously from student to student. Some began to change immediately as freshmen, but others never changed or did not change until their senior year, if they stayed in the University that long.

The passive conception of the student's role is evident in the above quotation from the girl who expected her professors to contact her about her poor work. Although a few students went to see their professors about their work, they were very much in the minority. The typical attitude was expressed by an upperdivision boy who wrote, "I have never known many of my professors very well because I rarely felt the need to speak with them. Also, for some unknown reason, I have always been hesitant to confer with them." Many students explained that they were reluctant to talk to their teachers because they saw it as currying favor. Those who thought of it as a violation of an informal code of student conduct were, to this extent, under the influence of a student culture. The analysis of this, and other, peer group influences on academic development is presented in Chapter VIII. Some students did not think it proper for a professor to extend himself in the student's behalf. A senior boy wrote, "I felt that the main job of college was up to me, and I could not expect my instructors to help me unless it was necessary. . . ."

An exception that proves the rule of student passivity in relations with professors, was reported by a senior boy who explained:

> Except for the last semester of my college career, I did not get acquainted with very many of my professors. My last semester, however, I had many occasions to talk to all of my professors. I was sick a great deal and had to make arrangements for make-up work. From the experiences of this semester alone I have formed an opinion of professors in general. Most of them seem to be very nice and get a good deal of satisfaction and pleasure out of teaching. They are all very considerate of personal problems and are usually willing to do all they can to help you. . . . I wish I had known that professors were nice people before this. I was always somewhat reluctant to go see professors and tell them my problems and/or have them help me with my work. . . . I just did not realize the value of their services or that they were so willing to help.

The exceptional circumstances of his illness forced him to overcome the typical passivity and remoteness of students' relations with the faculty and to take some initiative in the relationship.

The student's conception of himself as an inferior, helpless being in his relations with a superior, powerful professor was especially evident among freshmen. A junior girl recalled her reaction by saying:

> Most of my teachers scared me to death. It seemed as though their main goal was to flunk students out. . . . The one course that I really enjoyed was English History, but again I was afraid to go in and talk to my professor. Since then I have learned that professors are quite human.

However, many students never overcome this anxiety, as was true of the senior boy, who described his attitude as follows:

> My relations with my professors have usually been very formal. . . . I am very reluctant to go speak with my professors personally. I'm not sure why I feel this way. I think that sometimes I'm afraid I'll be wasting their time, or that I'm perhaps inferior to them in some ways. I've also thought that perhaps I'm just basically afraid of authority figures.

The reports of feeling helpless and fearful of faculty were often supported by stories of ruthless grading practices, arbitrary, capricious treatment, and overt hostility. A girl said of an instructor, ". . . the first day I walked into class he scared me to death. . . . I'm not used to having people actually reprimand me for. . . giving a wrong answer. They may correct me on it, but not. . . jump on me about it. . . ." Although such incidents were reported as exceptions to the observation that most professors were found to be considerate and helpful, the mere possibility of encountering such an instructor may account for some wariness and anxiety in the attitude of many students.

Most students, who commented on the remoteness and inaccessability of professors, thought it was an inevitable consequence of the university system, particularly the large size of some classes. A student who transferred from a small girls' college remarked, "I object to the psychological distance that professors at S. U. maintain with their students, but I cannot imagine how it could realistically be otherwise." Another girl, who noted a change toward more intimacy, observed:

> This distance has become less pronounced as I have gotten older. Especially in my field I feel this least, but I am more willing to approach all professors, and they seem less reluctant to part with their time. This could very well be my own decreasing reluctance to demand more.

This last statement very explicitly shows the closing of the social distance between student and professor, as well as the change from a passive to an active stance.

The statistics from our survey substantiated the impression of social distance between students and faculty obtained from our case material. Three-fourths of our sample did not know any faculty member outside the classroom. About one-sixth knew at least one member of the faculty in some kind of relationship outside the classroom, and only about one-tenth had a sustained or recurring personal relationship (see Appendix B, Table 48).

Students' attitudes toward their professors had a bearing on the learning process. As these qualities of passivity, helplessness, and distance were supplanted by activity, competence, and familiarity the students reported feeling pleasure and interest in their studies. When they liked their work they said they worked harder at it, and, presumably, they learned more.

Attitudes of Professors

From the student's point of view, the extent to which these changes took place was largely determined by characteristics of their professors. The qualities often mentioned by students were: (1) personal interest in his students, (2) enthusiasm for his subject, (3) teaching techniques, (4) knowledge of his subject, and (5) level of expectation. They are listed in the order of the frequency with which they were mentioned.

Personal interest referred particularly to concern about students' progress in courses, but included help with personal as well as academic problems. It was contrasted with indifference or even dislike, and preoccupation with other things, especially his research. A senior boy observed that he disliked courses taught by men ". . . who seemed not at all interested in the student, and always appeared in a hurry to leave the class and get back to their research or to rush away to something they found more interesting. . . ."

The effect on grades of a professor's interest in his students was explained by an engineering student who said of his underclass years:

> My grades were above average, but I still knew I should do better. I had little contact with the instructors, principally because they seemed totally unconcerned about the individual student. They would talk to you, say yes or no, but were obviously not truly concerned about your problems. You take the tests and you pass or fail, period.

But in his junior year--

> For the first time in my college career I found an instructor who seemed to take an interest in the student. I often talked to him concerning the course I had under him as well as other courses. I made good grades in his course, mostly because I felt like exerting an effort.

An unusually capable girl made the following generalization of her experience, "I always do better work in a class in which the teacher is friendly and takes a personal interest in me and everyone. I will work very hard for an encouraging teacher."

The scholarly development of students is stimulated by the professor's attitude through a chain of intermediate causes. Thus, because the instructor is believed to be personally concerned about the student, the latter likes his teacher. Since he likes the instructor the student tries to do what the instructor wants, that is, to work hard on his assignments. Because he works hard, he learns more and gets higher grades than he would for an indifferent professor. Generally, the student's liking for a professor and his course go hand in hand, though there are exceptions. A student in an honors section described his reaction as a ". . . paradox of enjoying the course and intensely disliking the professor." The fact that he called it a paradox implied that, with this exception, liking the professor and his course went together.

Over and over the students we studied told us how important it was that the professor have an enthusiastic interest in his subject. Much less often did they comment on the content of a course being interesting. When asked what courses were the worst she had taken, a senior girl said:

> Well, the worst courses don't particularly fall in any one area. I do hate to take courses in which the instructor or professor just stands up and lectures and seems to give the appearance that he doesn't like what he's talking about or shows no interest, no motivational effect upon the students. Something that is just cut and dried to me has no interest at all.

Some students explained the motivational effect in terms of a kind of imitative contagion, thus, "If I feel that he doesn't care, neither do I." Others thought of it in terms of exchange, as did the senior boy who wrote, "School was made very interesting by the fact that all my instructors seemed to be men dedicated to their work. I really felt like I should work for these men since they were trying so hard to do something for me."

Although students often appraised their professors in terms of teaching techniques, these were invariably secondary in importance to general enthusiasm for the subject. Other qualities often mentioned were careful preparation, clear presentation of abstract ideas, skillful handling of discussion, giving examinations that measured the material presented in the course, prompt return and adequate discussion of examinations, use of unusual and stimulating classroom techniques, and good sense of humor.

Students generally were of the opinion that teaching skills overcame any handicaps to learning in large classes. We asked the students in our sample, ". . . how would you compare the big lecture classes with small classes? Which kind did you get most out of?" Students recognized that certain subjects could be taught better in small than in large classes, but, with these exceptions, they invariably agreed that size, alone, was not the crucial variable. The professor's skill as a lecturer was far more important. The point was illustrated by a senior who said of the professor who taught an introductory course in one of the social sciences:

> Dr. Cohen was extremely gifted at holding the interest of a large group over his subject. He was obviously interested in his subject. I don't know whether it was intrinsically more interesting than, say, botany, for example; but at least with Dr. Cohen lecturing, it was. So I would say, really as a general rule, I prefer the smaller classes, but with the right people running a large lecture section, I have nothing against that type of class.

Most students took the position that frequent testing and grading was desirable. They wanted to know where they stood and they admitted that examinations were an important incentive to study. At the same time students wanted to be treated as responsible, self-disciplined adults. This ambivalence was clearly expressed by a senior engineer who said that one of his instructors--

> . . . has an attitude I like, yet it has one drawback. He would rather lecture and give everyone a passing grade, but let each student learn as much as he wishes. The main difficulty here is lack of incentive. It's human nature to slack off when one is not pushed, and unless a person is mature enough to drive himself, he may well learn nothing from this type of teaching. . . .

It was important to students that their teachers have a thorough command of their subject, but lack of knowledge was rarely detected. Students were usually impressed by, and often commented on, the erudition of their professors. A boy who flunked a required course remarked, with admirable detachment, that it had been a rare privilege to have studied under a man who possessed such vast knowledge. Only occasionally did students find fault with inadequate command of a subject. A girl said of an instructor:

> There was one that I didn't think was very good at all, but fortunately, he's gone this semester. . . . The course was supposed to be a discussion course, and he lectured. What he lectured about we already read in the book and he didn't say one thing different. We all knew it anyway, because the readings were so easy.

A senior boy declared:

> Only once have I had a professor who I felt did not know his material. Since this was a problem-working course, it was most discouraging to spend a whole weekend on a set of problems, only to have the instructor simplify them so they could be worked quite easily or to work them wrong.

Finally, the attitude of professors toward their students as persons was important for scholastic development. A girl said of her freshman English teacher, "He treated the members of the class as if they were intelligent adults, and he expected good work from them. I responded to this by trying to do better work and develop a more mature attitude." The contrary effect of a professor who expected poor work was described by a girl as follows: ". . . my Spanish teacher seemed to have the idea I knew no Spanish. I could not speak the language fluently. Every time I went into the class I would forget words I had known for two years. I lost all confidence in myself when I felt that he had none in me."

In some cases the impact on the student of being treated as a capable adult marked a turning point in his career. A junior girl wrote:

> . . . in college, I have met some half dozen men who have recommended themselves to me through common possession of sincerity, sensitivity to other people, self-respect, deep love of his own work, and tolerance. These have all been men on the staff at S. U. They are young men and old, full professors and men at the graduate level. But all symbolize much of what my father has denied me and given instead to his professional clients. All have the quality of mercy and trust which will offer people the benefit of the doubt, and all six have treated me as a trustworthy, productive adult, worthy of interest and encouragement. I have identified with these men enough to know that I want to continue to graduate school and. . . not only work with my own professional ideas but in the hope that I may provide like examples and stimulus to future wavering, unhappy kids.

Her insight suggests a plausible psychological explanation for the power of the professor's influence at least in some cases. Having felt deprived of her father's concerned guidance she found a paternal substitute in her professors and, as a consequence of identification with their roles, chose a similar professional career.

Conclusion

We have seen that at S. U. the development of the student's role in his relations with professors is formed through direct experience in the classroom, more than in accordance with learned patterns of conduct. In short, it would be misleading to say that students' relationships with their professors were molded by a student subculture. I say this because culture is a pattern of conduct learned prior to experience. It is a set of expectations that a person, socialized by a group, brings to a situation which enables him to cope more effectively with persons and objects than would otherwise have been possible. Such shared patterns for coping with professors at S. U. were minimal. By and large each student learned from personal experience with little help from others. It is more fitting to characterize this student body as a mass of individuals than a community of persons.

The development of students' relations with professors showed certain typical sequences. Characteristically, freshmen began their classwork in awe of their professors and with an attitude of helpless passivity. But nearly all of them learned from experience that most of their instructors were interested in students and their problems. An occasional professor aroused their enthusiasm for his subject. Skillful teaching and extensive knowledge earned the respect of most students. Some tried to live up to their professors' expectations of high standards of scholarship. Through these influences, which students saw as emanating from the faculty, they were drawn into closer relations with their teachers and a more active participation in the academic enterprise. A few identified personally with individual professors and accordingly decided to pursue a graduate degree or even become professors themselves.

CHAPTER IV

THE ADVISEE ROLE AND RELATIONS WITH ADVISORS

Students' relations with professors are also formed by their experience with them as advisors. Every student who enters the School of Letters and Sciences is assigned to an advisor of freshman and sophomore students until he completes the requirements for junior standing. At this point the student must choose a major subject and thereafter he is instructed to see an advisor in the department or program of his major. The advising system differs in other schools of the university, and since our sample did not include sufficient students from these schools for reliable conclusions, this analysis is limited to the situation in the School of Letters and Sciences.

Letters and Sciences freshmen see their advisors for the first time during the orientation period. After that the student must see an advisor during the enrollment period before each semester. He is also urged to confer with his advisor during a specified week at the middle of each semester, especially if he has been notified that his grades are unsatisfactory.

Freshmen and Sophomores

Most of the comments students made about their advisors concerned their consultations during enrollment days at the beginning of semesters. Since little was said about the meeting during freshman orientation, whatever impression was made may have been lost in the welter of events during that exciting episode. The few remarks made about conferences at mid-semester time suggests that students rarely took advantage of this opportunity to meet with their advisors.

The ideal conception of the academic advisor, portrayed by college administrators, differed drastically from the image revealed to us by our informants. Instead of the competent, receptive, and wise counselor, the freshmen and sophomores saw him as a not too competent bureaucrat. Aside from the fact that the student had to obtain the advisor's signature on his enrollment card, it was desirable to see him because he knew the intricacies of degree requirements and the myriad rules of academic procedure. A senior boy aptly described this aspect of the advisor's role by saying:

> . . . he knows what requirements you are going to need to graduate, and he knows how many hours it is going to take to get them. He has all the information there, I think, in the college catalogue and other literature put out by the University. It's very helpful to have someone who acts as sort of an attorney to interpret the documents for you.

The role of an impersonal, legal expert was far from the model the Dean had in mind when he instructed his team of advisors.

Our sample of students was asked about the relationship with their advisors during the first two years of college. Their responses were classified into four intervals from personal to impersonal. Two out of five advisors were described as warm and friendly as manifested by willingness to go out of their way to be helpful, interest in the student as a person, and wanting to discuss his problems. One in six were said to be friendly, but somewhat impersonal in that they were not inclined to discuss the student's problems or take time for more than essential needs. One-third of the students thought their advisor was indifferent, showing no genuine interest in the student and his problems. The relationship was reduced to its mechanical essentials. A very small proportion of students (7 percent) reported that their advisor, not only showed no interest in the advisee and treated him brusquely, but the student got the impression that he was imposing on the advisor by taking his time (see Appendix B, Table 44).

Most students discovered, after a semester or two, that their advisor was not an entirely reliable guide. A freshman girl, whose advisor had been a member of the S. U. faculty for ten years, said:

> I knew what I wanted to take and he saw whether he could fit them in or not, and then asked me if there was something else I would like to take. And I knew nothing about anything, so I can't say as I feel he really helped me any at all. . . . he was very nice. . . , but he also arranged it so that I had two classes at the same time. . . Outside of that, he's been a very good advisor.

In addition to wariness about advisors because they were known to make mistakes, students discovered other reasons for avoiding their advice. Very commonly a weak student wanted to take easy courses so he could raise his grade-point average, while his advisor wanted him to take courses that would fulfill graduation requirements. A freshman boy, who was on academic probation, said of the courses taken during his first semester:

> Well, I didn't like any of them. . . My advisor kind of just gave them to me, whereas this semester I knew better than to let him give me what I didn't want. So now I've got courses I like. . . . But he tried to give me five hours of my foreign language this semester and five hours of history, and there's two five-hour courses right there. If I'd mess up in either one of them that'd be the end.

Students had in mind many considerations, outside the formal academic regulations, when they planned their programs, many of which they concealed from their advisors. Since advisors were often aware of some of these considerations, the interaction between student and advisor, instead of being an exchange characterized by mutual confidence and trust, was often like a contest of wits.

The student panel's remarks about advisors were also classified, on the basis of the latter's knowledge of courses and requirements, into three categories: helpful, convenient, and harmful. Only one-third of those who had opinions said their advisors were helpful in planning their program of studies and offered good suggestions. Two-fifths described them as convenient in the sense that they confirmed and approved what the student had independently planned, but they were not much help. One-fifth, however, said their advisors had given misinformation and had pressured their advisees into taking courses the students were not interested in or didn't need (see Appendix B, Table 45).

Experienced students usually exercised considerable initiative in preparing their own schedules. Though students occasionally expressed gratitude that their advisors had pointed out that changes must be made in their plans to avoid running afoul of some obscure regulation, when we asked how they arrived at their schedule and if anyone helped them, a typical response was, "I worked it out myself and my advisor okayed it." This self-reliance was, of course, encouraged by the faculty, and students were often told that they were fully responsible for knowing and following the rules. However, a rare student was known to carry self-reliance beyond the range of legitimacy by forging his advisor's signature. Since only detected offenders were known it was impossible to estimate the incidence of this kind of evasion of correct procedure.

When students made decisions on the choice of courses and instructors, they consulted, not only the formal sources of advisors and catalogues, but also informal sources of advice. The way these kinds of information were interwoven was explained by a senior boy:

> Usually when I hear about a course. . . I will check it out in the catalog and see what it covers and what the prerequisites are. . . And I talk to people whom I know are good students, who have done well in the course, and then find out from them, really, if the course is interesting and just what it involves. . . . I don't always do this. I select some courses just because they sound good in the catalog.

In keeping with the bureaucratic image of their advisor, few lower-division students reported getting much help at midsemester time after they received notice of unsatisfactory grades. Some said they could never find their advisor in his office or he broke appointments. Most of those who did talk with their advisors said they received perfunctory treatment. A freshman boy remarked, ". . . he didn't care too much about the down-slips, he just handed it to me and told me to do better next time." However, on the whole, there was scant evidence of concern among students over the accessibility and helpfulness of advisors. Apparently very few students saw their advisors at the midsemester period.

Upperclassmen

Relations of upperclassmen with the advisors for their major subjects were even more distant and tenuous than those of freshmen and sophomores. In fact, it was not uncommon for a student to declare that he did not have a major advisor. Sometimes such statements were made by students who reported consulting the professor who, in fact, was an advisor to majors in his department, but whom the student didn't realize possessed that title. For example, a senior who was asked, "Do you have an advisor here on the campus this fall?" answered, "Not that I know of. You're assigned a major advisor when you go through enrollment, but they've never said specifically who that is. When I want to talk to anyone in the department, I usually go to Dr. Martin, who is head of the Public Administration majors."

Some students asserted that they choose their own major advisors, as was the case with the senior girl who told us:

> I've had three changes of advisors, and last year I finally kind of latched myself onto Dr. Worthington. He has been looking after me ever since then. I go in to [see] him if I'm having trouble in certain areas or. . . if I'm not sure where my credits stand, but I don't specifically have one person to go to.

This informal way of arranging advisor-advisee relationships, in which the latter has room for initiative, apparently reflects a fluid state within many departments in which students were free to consult any member of the staff they liked and the professors were adaptable enough to help any student who sought them out.

Though students saw their advisors on technical, academic problems, they were more inclined to take personal problems to someone else. A freshman girl said of advisors:

> . . . if you really are having trouble you could always find them, but really, I don't think they have too many students coming up to them all the time. I don't know, maybe I'm wrong, but if you have problems or anything you go and talk to your roommate or the kids in the dorm or even to your [dormitory] counselor, or even to your house director in the dorm, rather than trot all the way up here on the campus to talk to your advisor.

Conclusions

In general, students related to their advisors in a rather formal way that was only slightly less distant than with the professors in whose classes they were enrolled. They were treated more as a bureaucrat than counselor, who was supposed to know all the rules and regulations, but who couldn't be counted on always to be right. Furthermore, they were inclined to want their advisee to enroll in courses that were antithetical to his private and more short-run goals. Many upperclassmen, however, achieved a more personal tie with their major advisors within a context that both of them recognized as an informal relationship.

CHAPTER V

STUDYING: DIMENSIONS AND MOTIVES

Studying is the primary activity of the college student. His school work occupies more of his time than anything else, and it prepares him for effective performance in the classroom where he carries out his central role in the formal structure of the university. Studying is the principal means available to the student for reaching the formal goals of higher education. In terms of the theory of the social act, it fills much of the middle phase, characterized by perception and manipulation, that lies between impulse and consummation.

In the minds of S. U. students, studying was always thought of as something that went on elsewhere than in the classroom, lecture hall, or laboratory, and, therefore, in the absence of a teacher. Hence, students often referred to studying as "outside" work. It took place in the student's room, in the Library, and in other reasonably quiet places.

The term studying will be used here in a broad sense to include all forms of school work. In addition to the traditional kinds of scholarly endeavor--reading and writing--it includes work on exercises, problems, and projects. In student discourse, the latter activities are differentiated from studying, as they were by the art student who wrote, "I had very little actual studying to do. Most of my outside work consisted of working on projects and painting."

Most students accepted studying as a necessary, though somewhat unpleasant, activity. This view was held even by some of those who participated in the honors program, as was true of the girl who declared:

> Studying is the one thing I dislike the most about college work. I am not being insincere when I say this. I am very anxious to learn a great deal about the various subjects which are offered in college courses, but I dislike the idea that so much of this knowledge must be accumulated through reading and studying written material. This seems like a second hand way in which to learn things. I would much prefer to learn through conversation or actual experience and investigation.

Her extreme views may be partially attributed to defective vision which she claimed made it impossible for her to read for prolonged periods of time, but she expressed with unusual clarity the point of view of many others whose distaste for studying had a less apparently legitimate basis.

Although, ideally, the purpose of higher education is to acquire knowledge, the students at S. U. talked about more tangible goals. Obtaining a degree was, for most students, the formal, concrete goal of enrollment at the university, but this remote objective was reduced to less distant goals of fulfilling diverse requirements by enrolling in courses and accumulating a certain number of credits at a minimum grade level. The grade in each course was determined by the degree of success in fulfilling a series of immediate objectives such as taking examinations, writing papers, and preparing for oral recitations. Students saw themselves studying for these proximate goals. By their attainment the ultimate goals were automatically taken care of.

Dimensions

Students described the way they studied in terms of several different characteristics. They talked about how hard they studied, the amount of time spent studying, whether effort was sustained or intermittent, and whether the process was enjoyable or not. Nearly all students characterized courses according to one or a combination of these variables.

When a student said he studied hard it meant that he concentrated on his material, as well as spent more than a little time on it. These two aspects of hard studying, however, were sometimes distinguished, as they were by the sophomore girl who enumerated her problems in studying as "(1) finding time to study, (2) slow reading, and (3) lack of concentration." Students often used the verb *concentrate* to describe the hardness of studying, as well as other terms that denoted intense effort, such as, "applying myself" to my work and "digging in" to my studies.

The amount of time students spent studying appeared to run about 30 hours in a typical week, though, in addition, they intermittently stayed up most of the night cramming for an examination or completing a paper. Although, we made no attempt to obtain an exact accounting from our informants, we gained the impression that a majority of S. U. students exceeded the conventional standard of two hours of preparation for every hour in class. However, there was a great deal of variation. A sophomore boy, who held a prestigeful scholarship, admitted he fell short of the standard advocated by the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences when he said, "I study in a hit-or-miss fashion. Some nights I'll do a lot of studying, other nights I'll do hardly any. But I don't think I put in the two hours we're supposed to for every hour in class."

The amount of studying went in cycles. A common pattern was reported by the freshman engineer who, when asked how much he studied, answered, "Seven or eight hours a day Monday through Thursday, and on Sunday, if I have a test on Monday or something pressing. . . . Every weekend, just about, there's a party at Capital City or Metropolis; or if there isn't anything on, we go to the show or something." Friday afternoon and evening was the conventional time for beer drinkers to quench their thirst, and weekend evenings were for parties. But these activities were usually forgone to prepare for important examinations. The scheduling of examinations--especially finals, mid-terms, and those preceding vacations--imposed irregular periods of intensive studying on the more regular weekly cycle. During their sophomore and junior years, students often reported slumps in studying. The slump was experienced as a general loss of interest, a state of ennui, when studying just didn't seem worth the effort.

Most students expressed some kind of feeling about studying as pleasant or unpleasant. Some, even among the bright ones, thought of it as a form of work, bringing little, if any, intrinsic gratification. This differentiation of studying, as a form of work, from pleasure was implied in the following remark of a girl who held an honor scholarship: "I don't study all the time. I have plenty of time to relax and do things that I enjoy. . . . it always helps to plan your time so that you can relax and do things that you just plain enjoy doing." A freshman girl, also a participant in the honors program, expressed a more negative attitude when she said, "I'm behind and trying to catch up. Sometimes I could almost scream because I get sick of studying. . . " However, another girl in the honors program, reacted differently to her freshman year. She wrote, "I enjoyed my courses very much and was quite excited by all the new ideas and subjects I had discovered. . . . " Students' feelings toward studying were described by means of a number of other words and their implied antonyms, including pleasure, liking, interest, and stimulation. All of these terms expressed their sentiments toward the same, or a very similar, aspect of studying. When we classified the students in our sample into those who frequently or sometimes found pleasure and gratification in their studies, as contrasted with those who did so only occarionally or never, we found a sixty-forty percentage split, with the majority on the more positive side (see Appendix B, Table 41).

Stages of Studying

Students' experiences with studying can be fruitfully analyzed in terms of aspects of a human act. Since postponement of consummation, and uncertainty of success, characterize the academic side of college life, the concept of the act, developed by John Dewey, George H. Mead, Ellsworth Faris and other symbolic interactionists, admirably suits this purpose. These theorists developed a conceptual model that emphasized the sequence of stages in carrying out an act. They attached special importance to the middle stage, characterized by problems and frustrations brought about by interference with the course of action, in which emotion, imagination, and reasoning are prominent. The final stage of consummation and retrospection results in changes in the perception of objects, including others and one's self. The following analysis of studying will be presented under three aspects of an act that occur in sequence: motivation to study, problems in studying, and ways of coping with these problems.

Motivation

The variety of motives for studying revealed by students were classified into the sociologically relevant sources of self, other, and impersonal rules. Not surprisingly, a good many students talked about their desire to obtain an education. They clearly held an ideal image of themselves of becoming educated persons. Usually they wanted knowledge in specific fields, though some aspired to become broadly educated, as did the honor student who wrote, "I think that a well-educated man should know something from as many fields as possible. . ." On the other hand, an occasional student admitted that he actually had no desire for a higher education. This was the case with the farm boy who wrote:

> . . . I have failed to see any reason for attending college. My heart doesn't lie in my college work. My first love has always been the farm, and I can't seem to picture myself in any other vocation. I have failed to set scholastic goals for myself, and have even put off choosing a major until the last possible moment. . . . thinking that I would never finish college. . .

Though most students came to the University expecting to have fun while getting an education, there were a few with a more single-minded objective, such as the girl who transferred to the University after a year at a junior college. She said:

> I started out with a course [of study] which would have given me 25 hours credit [as compared with the normal program of 15 hours]. . . I worshipped intellect. . . I thought that I had come here to get an education alone, and that I would turn down activities to stay home every night and study.

A few took heavy loads so they could graduate in three years. Only one in our sample of 116 did this. It is appropriate to think of students as differing in the breadth and intensity of their aspirations.

Most students phrased their academic ambitions, not in terms of the kind or amount of knowledge they desired, but in terms of the grade level they aspired to. Typically, they tried to get as many Bs as possible, a few aimed for As, and some were content with Cs--the minimum average grade needed by upperclassmen to avoid being placed on academic probation. Usually, students entered the University with a tentative conception of their academic level, based on their high school grades, which they revised to fit the realities of the situation as revealed by their first semester marks. A downward revision of aspiration level seemed more often necessary than an upward correction, as was the case with the freshman girl who told the interviewer, "I started out studying hard when I came here, thinking I would make all As, but for me to make all As I would have to study all the time, and it wouldn't be worth it. So I decided to do what I could and not aim for all As. . . ." She was actually able to maintain only a C average for the two years she attended the University. Occasionally a student discovered that he was capable of earning higher grades. A junior girl wrote:

> I am basically quite lazy and in my classwork I have not done the very best possible. This was especially true in my freshman year. I felt that getting an A was impossible for me and so contented myself with trying for Bs. Since my freshman year, I have done about the best I could, especially the last semester of my sophomore year when I had a 3.8 average*. ...

An atypical response to disappointing performance was reported by a sophomore girl, whose impressive high school record had earned her a scholarship and admission to the honors program. She explained:

> In my freshman courses I wound up with a 2.0 g.p.a. I was terribly disappointed. . . . I couldn't figure it out as everyone had told me how smart I was. I finally realized I wasn't the genius I thought I was. After I decided that, I buckled down to learn the subjects themselves and not worry about grades.

Instead of lowering her aspiration level, as did most of the students in this predicament, she rejected the grading system, and enjoyed the courses whose content she liked, regardless of her marks. Although her g.p.a. was only 2.7 at the end of her sophomore year, a professor, with whom she took an upper division course, nominated her for an undergraduate research award. The results of her investigation were presented at a national meeting of a scientific society in a paper of which she was junior author. Few students have sufficient personal autonomy to defy the grading system while establishing a reputation for competent scholarship. One of the merits of the undergraduate research awards (analyzed more fully in the chapter on the honor student role) is that they make this possible. The participant can gain a sense of real achievement and recognition from others for tangible accomplishments completely outside the grading system.

A student's self-conception of his ability and potential was often affected by the attitudes of others with whom he associated, including his teachers, advisor, peers, and parents. Usually these conceptions were congruent with the student's own appraisal of himself and were, therefore, supportive and reinforcing in their effects. His self-concept and his social role were in harmony. But occasionally students thought the evaluations of others were unrealistic, and, if the opinions of these others were significant to him, the inconsistency became a cause of stress. A sophomore described this conflict between self-concept and social role as follows:

> Second semester [of last year] I made the mistake of getting a 4.0 g.p.a. Naturally, I was glad, but I have since had the feeling that I actually didn't deserve it. I was carrying only 15 hours. . . and they actually weren't hard courses. Probably any college student would have made the same grades under the same circumstances, but, because I did, everyone now has the mistaken idea that

---

*Grades at S. U. were averaged by assigning weights for letter grades of four for an A to one for D and zero for a failure. The arithmetic average, called a grade-point average, was referred to by students as the "g.p.a."

> I can always make good grades, or, at least, always should make good grades.

It was true that in no other semester did she again earn all As, but that one impressive performance was sufficient to establish a reputation that endured at least into her sophomore year.

Once a student defined a level of scholarship that he thought appropriate for his ability and interests, a change in this level affected his sense of self-worth. An engineering student, who failed a course, said, it was ". . . another blot on my record and another blow to my pride." The intensity of the pressure a student can bring on himself was revealed in the following report by a student who graduated with a Phi Beta Kappa key. She recalled:

> More pressure came from myself than any outside influence, for I felt I would not be doing justice to myself or my courses if I did not do my best. I remember one evening before a philosophy exam. Dr. Norton had given the test to us in advance, and I became panicky because I was at a loss for knowing what to say or how to organize my paper. I felt inadequate because this was a course for juniors, seniors, and graduate students, and I was only a sophomore. Furthermore, I had enrolled in the course four weeks after the semester had started. That night I literally walked the floor and came the closest to having a nervous breakdown of any time in my life. Fortunately, late that night, I settled down to studying and was all right in the morning.

Self-worth is affected, not so much by high or low grades, as such, but by the disparity between the grades the student expects and the grades he gets. It is the relative difference between the level of achievement he sets for himself and his performance, as measured by the grading system, that affects his sense of self-worth. Self-generated pressure to study appears to be essential for success as a student, even for the brightest of them.

The process of setting a standard of performance, and pressuring oneself to maintain or exceed it, was reported by a girl who participated in the honors program. In November of her first semester, when asked how S. U. was different from her expectations, she responded:

> Well, I didn't expect to study as much. . . . It's a good thing you didn't talk to me, though, before Parents' Day because I was all ready to go home. . . because I'm not doing too well. In fact, I haven't even had one A yet; but, after my folks came up and Daddy talked it over with me, I decided to stay. Daddy said to stick it out the first semester because that's just sort of to get oriented and to find your level.

Three and a half years later, when asked: Have you ever felt under pressure to make grades?, she answered, "Just goals that I set for myself; not ones that other people impose." Having overcome the impulse to withdraw from the University, when her performance first fell below her self-defined standard, she subsequently became strongly motivated to work for higher grades.

Social pressures to study came from both adults and peers. More important than the influence of the faculty, which was described above, were the expectations of parents and other persons in their home towns. A senior girl in the honors program, who declared that most of the pressure to make grades came from herself, added that she also cared how she was evaluated by her peers, and that her parents merely wanted her to do her best, which they knew was A work. Since, in effect she said her parents didn't care what grades she got so long as they were As, this girl seemed to have understated their influence relative to her self-imposed discipline. In her case, self and parental influences merged into one, and it could be said that she had so deeply internalized her parents' attitudes that she perceived them as her own, and she could honestly say they had not pushed her to achieve. Peer influences on studying came from friends of both sexes, roommates, and fellow members of the same residential group.

Rules and Standards

The personal pressures to study were reinforced by impersonal rules and standards. Requirements for degrees were specified by the schools of the University in terms of the amount and quality of prescribed course work, measured quantitatively in terms of credit hours and qualitatively by grades. To remain in good academic standing an upper division student in the School of Letters and Sciences had to maintain a C average (2.0 g.p.a.), otherwise he was placed on probation and, if he failed to perform above this minimum during probation, he was suspended. Lower division students had to attain a g.p.a. of at least 1.8. The effectiveness of the abstract rule for remaining in good academic standing was pointed out by a boy who wrote, ". . . my first semester was characterized by intensive study because I was actually very frightened of 'flunking out.'"

Grades were used by the University as a qualification for eligibility for a number of other things besides continued attendance at the University. To participate in intra-mural sports or fill an office in an organization, a student must have had grades of C or better in 60 percent of his subjects. To be considered for membership in a sorority the girl must have had a grade-point average of at least 2.0. A variety of formal honors could be achieved by earning high grades, including such things as listing on the Dean's Honor Roll, graduating cum laude, and qualifying for one of the many honor societies. Students who held honor scholarships were acutely aware of the necessity for maintaining a high grade-point average to keep from having the scholarship withdrawn.

The rules of the faculty were reinforced by others made by the students. An interfraternity regulatory agency set the minimum g.p.a. for initiation. This rule was mentioned by a freshman who described his expectations of college by saying:

> I figured it would be an awful lot of fun. I heard about the great parties they have up here, and I was eager to get to college. It turns out that it isn't nearly as much fun as I thought it would be. You have to be constantly studying in order to get by. (Interviewer: Did you plan to work any harder in college than you did in high school?) No, I hadn't until I came up here. I realize now that I am going to have to work to stay in school. I'm not sure right now if I am going to make my grades for the fraternity or for the university.

He didn't. His g.p.a. was 1.5. Individual fraternities and sororities imposed additional regulations on their members. Many of them required members, particularly pledges who had not yet been initiated, to attend a study hall. Some fraternities set a minimum grade-point average to continue living in the house.

The use of the grade-point average was more than a bureaucratic convenience of the University administrators; it was also the conventional device students used to appraise one another's academic standing. Thus, in the yearbook, a special section had always been devoted to pictures and sketches of outstanding seniors. Their g.p.a. was invariably mentioned along with other signs of academic achievement, thus: ". . . Susan has a 3.76 g.p.a. and has been on the Dean's Honor Roll every semester. . ."

Professors exerted impersonal pressure to study primarily by giving examinations. Some students said they never read assignments until the night before an examination, and others rarely did so. In typically passive fashion, a junior girl blamed her procrastination on the infrequency of examinations. She wrote:

> My grades during the first semester were good (g.p.a. 3.2). I think the main problem I had in college studies was in trying to keep up with the large amount of reading. . . it is hard for me to keep up with the reading when there is no incentive to do so. For example, there is no frequent testing on the material that you have to read. So, I would let all my reading slide until right before the test and then cram all night. . . . I still follow the rule: Read it when you have to.

If we can take this student at her word, the content of her reading assignments was not an incentive, only the external pressure of examinations.

Although comments on the importance of examinations relative to other incentives to study were volunteered by our subjects, and no question on this point was explicitly scheduled in our interviews, I gained the distinct impression that the practice of postponing a substantial part of the reading assignments until just before examinations was as common among bright students as among those of average ability. Perhaps this was because they could get away with it and still make satisfactory grades. A girl, who was invited into the highly selective honors program, described her studying by saying:

> In Geography particularly, I don't study for anything but the tests. . . in my Spanish course, I just do my assignments haphazardly, or just rush through them right before class. I don't really learn the material, I just zoom through it. I hate to think about the final. . . I'll usually study pretty hard for a test.

One student in our sample made no special preparation for final examinations. He admitted, "I can't honestly say I studied for finals. . . . they [members of the fraternity to which he was pledged] kept riding me. . . I'd say, yeah, yeah, I'm studying real hard; but I wouldn't. I'd sit around and read paperback novels and stuff." At the end of his freshman year, he was dropped from the University for poor scholarship. There were, of course, students who worked systematically and prepared for class meetings in some, if not all of their courses, but they were uncommon among those we studied. Among the students in our panel, one-fifth were classified as perfectionists who put forth much effort, spent long hours studying, and tried very hard. Three-fifths were found to have worked moderately hard, though their efforts were not constantly sustained. The remaining fifth made little or no effort to study systematically (see Appendix B, Table 42).

The method of evaluating students by assigning grades based on frequent examinations was antithetical to genuine scholarship. Instead of rewarding the student for exploring ideas at his own pace, the rewards went to the students who beat the system by such techniques as last minute cramming for examinations. Under this scheme it was no wonder that professors constantly complained that their students came to class ill-prepared for oral presentation. The time required for careful daily preparation wasn't worth the effort it required. An awareness of the problem was manifested by the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences who advised his faculty to give fewer examinations.

Some upperclassmen reported concern over the impression their academic records would make on potential employers. A senior boy recalled:

> When I first started college I had a very difficult time studying and concentrating.

> . . . I decided that if I wanted to become a chemical engineer, I must be determined to make my grades since most employers want to have men of better grade averages who apply themselves. . . . but I still can't sit still very long. I keep thinking of other things to do.

Vocational aspiration, along with a variety of other influences, were cited by a boy who transferred to the University in his junior year. He wrote:

> At State U. I have realized that I had better get to work on my grades. . . . Because of Susan [his girl], my friends in Tau Xi, and my parents and their advice, plus the realization that in several years I will be looking for a job, . . . I am studying harder and I care about my grades and about what other people think of me--two things which I ignored in junior college. . . Most important of all, I go to sleep at night knowing that I have done something, that I am working for my future, and my conscience doesn't bother me.

In his case, as with most students, the pressures to study came from several sources that reinforced one another.

Conclusion

Studying, from the student's point of view, was a form of work that was sometimes pleasurable, but usually required self-disciplined effort. Each student studied for a level of achievement that he set for himself. For most students this level was a compromise between his initial aspiration and the grades he was able to earn. The level of aspiration reflected the attitudes of his parents and friends as well as himself.

Social pressures to study were implemented through the grading system. It consisted of a complex body of impersonal rules and standards that were created and enforced by institutionalized agencies or agents, including the University Senate, the faculties of the several schools, academic departments, the Student Council, fraternities and sororities, student organizations, and individual professors. These norms differed in scope, many being required of all students, others only of members of specific groups or categories, and some were standards the student, himself, chose to be guided by.

Though most university rules were looked on as imposed restrictions, and were sometimes flagrantly violated, others, especially those that comprised the grading system, were internalized and had a powerful, constraining influence on behavior. The way students appraised themselves in terms of their grade-point averages was striking evidence that they had internalized this device. Though grading apparently originated out of the need of teachers to evaluate the knowledge of their pupils, and force them to study, at S. U. it had become objectified into an impersonal body of abstract rules with many added functions affecting the status and participation of students in campus life.

CHAPTER VI

PROBLEMS OF STUDYING

When students talked about the problems and obstacles they encountered in studying to achieve the level of performance to which they aspired, they most often mentioned the enormous amount of work to be done. Other problems they talked about were the competition for their time from other activities; problems of adjustment such as worry, apathy, and sickness; and courses that were uninteresting, required, and especially difficult.

Volume of Work

A majority of students complained about the large amount of work they had to do for courses. This was true of honor as well as regular students. In fact, the most vehement statement recorded by an interviewer was made by a senior who earned his degree *magna cum laude.* He said:

> I do not like S. U., to be perfectly frank; . . . the university has made me work just too darn hard. . . I can think back a lot of nights when I stayed up all night, and not because I'd been lazy or anything, but just because I had so much to do. . . And, this wasn't just one night. . . maybe several nights a week. I've done this a lot of times. I felt like the University has required too much of me--maybe because I was conscientious enough to respond to all the pressure or something; I don't know. . . . earlier in the semester one of my professors said, "I was at the Auditorium last night. The Cleveland Symphony Orchestra was playing. . . and it was really appalling how few people were there." He thought it showed a state of mental torpor. . . But then there have just been too many times when I've had too much to do to go running off to symphony concerts, to see an art film, or go to a play. In my experience at S. U. I've never seen one play, I've never seen one concert, I've seen about one movie on the Campus--one of these special movies that has been brought around, none of these special groups that come here like the Kingston Trio or Louis Armstrong; . . . we've probably had some ballets but I've never been to them; I've been to one lecture in the Distinguished Scholar series; I've never been to the Poetry Circle. I belong to very few clubs--just because I felt that my first duty was to my school work, and this is why I feel just a little bit bitter.

There is neither evidence that he was an overachiever, nor that he overloaded himself with courses. He ranked in the 99th percentile on the American Council on Education psychological examination when he entered the University, and he took the full four years to complete the minimum number of credit hours required for graduation.

In contrast to this boy who felt bitter over the burden of school work, most students managed to take it in stride and still found time for other things. Though usually, students said they had to work much harder in college than in high school, there were some who said they worked just as hard in secondary school and were able to fulfill the demands of their professors. Paradoxically, some students reported getting higher grades when they carried heavier course loads, as was the case with a senior who said:

> And the funniest thing is, I can work better under pressure than I can when I'm not under pressure. The best grades that I've ever made up here are semesters when I'm taking seventeen hours or more. I'll take fourteen hours and I have a lot of extra time, and I don't use it.

Apparently, he worked more efficiently when under pressure.

The amount of school work increased greatly at the end of each semester. This was a consequence, not only of last minute preparation for final examinations, but also because papers were usually due at the end of the semester, many professors accelerated the presentation and assignment of material, and quite a few gave written examinations during the last week or two of the semester. A few days before the final examination period, a sophomore honor student said, "I've had a grinding week of hour exams and papers, and a few other things, so I haven't studied for finals. I've studied for my German final, but that's the only one."

Competition for Study Time

The things that take a student's time away from his studies are manifold. They range from informal activities with friends, dating, organized student activities, and paid employment. Informal group activities--what students call "messing around"--appeared to be the commonest competitor for study time. As one student put it: "I can always be talked into another hand of bridge, a short beer, a gab session, and so on. It takes me longer to settle down and get ready to study than it does to complete my assignments." Other distractions that were mentioned included watching television, bowling, and table tennis.

The attraction of the various forms of entertainment and play lay, not only in their intrinsic pleasure, but also in the process of socialization they afforded. Furthermore, to reject too many invitations from others was to forgo the opportunity to cultivate friendships, or to risk losing friends. A girl, who put her studies ahead of fun, observed, "Most of the girls are friendly to me, but I feel left out when it comes to doing things because I have said no several times since I had to study. [But] I feel that I can't let my teachers down." It was a sense of obligation to her professors rather than any intrinsic pleasure of studying that held her to her books. She found herself in the common student dilemma of having to choose between two different obligations--one to her peers and the other to her professors. Either choice carried with it deprivation as well as gratification. She apparently chose to give up immediate gratification and loyalty to her peers, for peace of mind in the classroom tomorrow, and duties to her professors.

A boy who made the opposite choice wrote:

> My roommate and his friends constantly laughed at me about my "cloddish" tastes, and this caused me to feel unaccepted by the group. . . a point of considerable anguish to me, and the poorer study conditions in the dorm, along with my job with the [family owned] corporation caused me to feel unhappy and under constant pressure. This semester I spent most of my time on dates, at shows, or at McGinty's [tavern]. This was somewhat of an experiment to see if I could "party" here as I had done in high school and not flunk out.

His withdrawal from any serious attempt to keep up in his studies was, in his opinion, a reaction to at least three kinds of problems: peer group play, disturbing noise in the dormitory, and time consuming employment. Such combinations of factors causing a single response more often happened than the quoted excerpts describing a specific factor usually imply.

Although financial problems were not salient in this college population, many students, especially among the boys, worked part time while attending school. A few worked as much as thirty or more hours a week. Some were known to hold two or three different jobs. Many of them said that their employment, along with other demands on their time, kept them from studying as much as they felt they should.

Ironically, although many students gave up study time for fun and organizations, no student reported sacrificing study time to attend cultural events on the campus. A number of students, as we have seen, regretted having to miss plays, concerts, public lectures, etc. because they had to spend their time studying. Organized groups that imposed demands on students' time included fraternities and sororities, extracurricular activities, and intercollegiate athletics.

The nature of studying in college is such that it is especially vulnerable to the competition of other activities. It must take place, with rare exceptions, in the company of other students whose studying requirements, proclivities, and habits, are often different from the student's own. He is forever having to choose between the almost constant need for studying, and recurrent demands on his time for participation in roles other than that of learner including those of friend in peer relations, resident in a dormitory or fraternity, partner in dating and marriage, and member of a student organization. In this respect the college student finds the situation different from elementary and secondary school where much of his work was performed in the classroom and homework was done in the seclusion of his own home and usually under some parental surveillance.

Studying also differs from other kinds of work in urban society--in factory, office, and shop--since it is done without personal supervision, and at a distance in time and place from the person who will judge its quality. Furthermore the judging is often several weeks away after the next examination. Although it goes on within a framework of rules and under authoritarian direction, studying is neither as controlled as the routinized work of bureaucrats, nor is it as free of formal constraints as the work of entrepreneurs and professionals.

Physical and Emotional Sickness

Illnesses that are somatic, psychosomatic, and emotional interfere with the studying of very nearly every student at some time in his college career. The emotional illnesses, that are symptomatic of personal maladjustments, are of primary interest because they are often precipitated, if not caused, by situational factors. However, we should not fail to mention mononucleosis which can aptly be called an occupational disease of college students. Though we did not specifically ask about sickness, one boy in our sample described his experience, as follows:

> I had a three week bout with mononucleosis during the spring semester last year. It pretty well laid me low for the semester. . . . I discovered it probably about a month after the semester had started. However, my doctor and I feel as we looked back on it that I'd had it for some time before it was discovered, probably well into the first semester. . . . I actually missed more school before I found out what was the trouble than I did afterwards. . . I could get up and feel all right for a while, eat breakfast, drink a couple of cups of coffee, and then just practically pass out. I was so tired on some days I couldn't, frankly, get up the energy to go to class. This went on for a while and I finally decided I better find out what was wrong.

When the disease goes unrecognized and efforts to cope with its symptons are ineffective, a student's academic level could decline and he might withdraw from the university while mistakenly attributing his failure to weaknesses in himself or the system. We could not test this proposition because we did not interview former students after they withdrew from the University.

Perhaps the most acute emotional distress was suffered by freshmen, especially during their first semester. Many of them became homesick over their first prolonged separation from their families. Those from small high schools, particularly, suffered the trauma of discovering that there were many students brighter than they were and that it was much harder to make high grades than they had expected. Two months after she had arrived on the campus, a small-town girl told us:

> I didn't like it up here at all, at first. I guess because I just wasn't used to it, and then I was worried sick about my lessons. Now I've quit worrying and my grades have started improving, too. I didn't know anyone up here, and at home everyone knew me. [There] I didn't have to worry about whether I knew anyone or not. (Interviewer: What did you expect S. U. to be like?) Well, I expected it to be big and hard, and I knew I'd have to study a lot, but I certainly didn't expect to have to study this much. In high school everything came much easier and in high school you didn't always have to have themes in on time.

Most students get over the initial social and intellectual shock of the freshman year, but a few need professional help, as was true of one overly conscientious youth. He wrote:

> In early July I was informed that I had been selected as a Factor Scholar. Now that honor was pregnant with meaning for me, for, as every high school boy in the state who gives two hoots for academic distinction knows, it is the most prestigious academic award at the University. Counterbalancing the elation over this award, however, was an increasing awareness of my academic deficiencies. I began to intensify my study habits and felt guilty every moment when I was not "hitting the books." At the same time I began to worry about such far off events as passing my orals or language examinations for my Ph. D. At nights I could not sleep. This anxious condition continued into the fall semester, so I went to see a doctor at the Student Hospital. He suggested that I arrange for an interview with the resident psychiatrist. This I did and thus began my program of psychotherapy. Though I received all *As* that semester, it was at the cost of much tension and self-punishment.

The success marked by winning the honor scholarship, instead of bringing unmixed satisfaction, induced anxiety over measuring up to the expected high level of academic performance.

Many students referred to themselves as having been a "scared freshman." The size of the University, the numbers of people, the separation from family and friends, as well as the large amount and high standard of school work, were all often mentioned as causes of their fear. But freshmen were not constantly in a state of panic. They also talked of thrilling and exciting experiences. In the mass, they exhibited manic fluctuations between despair and elation. There can be little doubt that the first year was more fraught with emotion than any of the other three.

The student who weathered the freshman year may have had trouble again in his sophomore year, but of a different kind. In January of her second year, a girl who had her mind set on Medical School, said:

> I found out that thing they call the "sophomore slump." Nobody told me about it. I'm so mad, I could scream. I don't know what's the matter with me. You get in some sort of a mental state, and most sophomores I know have it. . . I thought I thought up the term, but I was talking to a girl who goes to school in California and she said they use it out there. You know, a degree is so far away, and the excitement of being a freshman is gone.

The incidence of this malaise appeared to reach its peak around the middle of the second semester. In April, one of the honor students explained:

> Last year I was always determined to get everything done as soon as possible, and then relax afterwards, but now I'm getting to the point where I want to put things off. . . It could be just the particular time of year. I feel like I'm getting to the point where I've been studying all year, and I just want to forget it. I'm looking forward to getting out of school. . .

The typical emotional problem of the sophomore is opposite that of the freshman. It is boredom and apathy instead of fear and excitement.

Of course, not all sophomores experienced a slump. In his senior year, one of the honor students in our sample compared his college years in these words:

> . . . perhaps my freshman or my junior years were most difficult. That's when I spent the most time studying. My sophomore year, I made my best grades. . . and I really worked harder in terms of when I got down and hit the books. I hit them and absorbed the material and that was it. Not so much time sitting there and staring at the page. And that was the year that I enjoyed most, too. . . . I don't know whether I got good grades because I enjoyed the courses, or whether I enjoyed the courses because I got good grades.

None of our informants talked of a "junior slump," but several of them spoke of the "senior slump" as a common affliction. A girl in our sample described the experience in these words:

> This has been sort of my senior slump year, because last year I was doing fine, and then all of a sudden this year I couldn't get started, and I didn't study for about four weeks. . . (Interviewer: What do you mean by the senior slump?) Well, I just heard this term the other day. I had heard about the sophomore slump, but . . . someone just said that there was a senior slump, too, . . .

Another senior, who has since earned a Ph. D. degree and been appointed to an assistant professorship, explained her difficulty studying by saying that grades no longer mattered quite so much. The second semester senior has already received all the honors and awards he can expect to get, and a slight decline in his grades can only reduce his four-year average by an infinitesimal amount. An analysis of the academic records of those in our sample who completed their education by earning a degree showed that the higher their cumulative g.p.a. through the semester before the last, the more often was the g.p.a. for the last semester below the cumulative average up to that semester (see Appendix C, Table 5). However, even among those whose g.p.a. was 3.5 or higher only one-third had a lower g.p.a. in their last semester. This proportion suggests that only a minority were sufficiently affected by the senior slump for it to lower their grades.

The tendency toward regression in the grades of bright seniors was noted by the administrators of an important scholarship program. They considered making senior year awards only for the fall semester to students whose g.p.a. was near the minimum standard of 3.5. Thus their status could be reviewed before re-appointing them for their last semester, and those who suffered from the senior slump could be dropped so they would not be undeservedly designated as honor scholars at the commencement exercises.

It was no surprise that many students found great difficulty studying for courses they found uninteresting, especially when they were taken only to fill a degree requirement. A sophomore in our sample reacted to this situation with self-destructive rebellion. He explained why he was not doing well in French by saying:

> I could be quite a bit better if I'd study. The thing is, I didn't want to take French. I didn't want to take any language at all, and I was forced into it, consequently I have a feeling of rebellion in there and I'm going to get back at them by not studying. It's really hurting me, but (sic).

His failure to finish the sentence might be attributed to a mental block against facing reality. In spite of refusal to study, he got a D for the course and managed to evade the rules requiring a second course until, in his junior year, he could enter the School of Business which had no language requirement for graduation. His was one kind of hostile reaction that was not uncommon among boys, but rare among girls who apparently expressed aggression in more disguised ways.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that students at S. U. encountered a number of common problems in studying--some of them severe and many of them chronic. That students talked about these problems among themselves was evident from the currency of a phrase like the sophomore slump. This is the kind of situation in which one would expect to find collective solutions to problems and, if the solutions are established and transmitted to succeeding generations of students, a true subculture. The extent to which this happened is considered in the next two chapters.

CHAPTER VII

COPING WITH PROBLEMS OF STUDYING

Students used both legitimate and illegitimate means to solve the problems of studying. The actual ways of coping with the burden of school work ranged from legitimate means such as finding a suitable time and place to study, or learning to read rapidly, through the semi-legitimate techniques of cramming for examinations and taking easy courses, to the illegitimate devices of cheating.

Time and Place

A virtually universal problem among S. U. students was that of finding time and a place to study. Time was important for their work in a way that differed from most other occupations. The formal rules of the various schools within the University required a minimum amount of course work each semester and the assignments given by the professors had to be completed by the close of the semester, except under very unusual circumstances. The significance of time is implied in the use of the word hour for the academic work unit. Thus, the normal work load in the School of Letters and Sciences was fifteen or sixteen hours per semester, which derived from the assumption that the student was supposed to be sitting in a classroom for fifteen or sixteen hours per week. This so-called hour was actually of fifty minutes duration since the students were allowed ten minutes out of each hour to go to their next class, if they had one. There were so many other departures from the original concept that the word hour in this academic sense meant something quite different from a clock hour.

Time, for these students, was almost as important as it is for prisoners, but for opposite reasons. Though both have a specified amount of time to serve before they get out, the prisoner has a surplus of time on his hands, while the student has a dearth of time. The criminal has time to waste, but the student is always looking for time. The former has more time than he wants, the latter never has enough.

The many demands made on a student's time and the multitude of competing and attractive uses to which it could be put, imposed great strain on the individual. He had to allocate his available time among many different uses, with enough for studying so that there was movement toward the various proximate and ultimate goals of getting good marks on examinations and papers, passing courses satisfactorily, and, finally, earning a degree. Successful solution of this problem required a good measure of the familiar middle-class virtue of postponing immediate gratifications for distant goals. A student in our sample who failed to solve this problem had been invited into the honors program on the strength of his fine high school record and high scores on aptitude tests, but, in college, was placed on academic probation. In his junior year, he explained, ". . . I'd like to have made a little better grades, too; but it's just a matter of what you are going to sacrifice in order to do it." He was not willing to make the sacrifices. On the other hand another boy explained, "I've cut down on my dating and extra activities and my marks have risen in almost all of my subjects."

Many students described various devices for scheduling and routinizing their use of time, for example, a girl told us:

> Every day I make a list of what I have to do in the way of classwork and do not go to bed until I have everything on the list crossed off. Too, I have a rule in my room that there must be absolute quiet from seven to ten, and no one is allowed in the room. I have also learned to use my free hours during the day for studying. It was quite a surprise to me how easy it was to get things done when I was organized. In fact, I have many more free evenings for personal use since I budget my studying throughout the week.

Some students were helped by a clinic, established for this purpose by the University, as in the case of a boy who reported, "I took a course in the Student Study Service. Through hints in this course and willpower, I have improved somewhat. Probably the most important thing I have learned in this course was how to budget my time."

Allocating time didn't do the student much good unless he could also find a quiet, convenient place to study. This was no easy task. The dormitories and fraternity houses in which most of the students lived were reported to be noisy and often inadequately equipped. A boy who entered the University in his junior year, wrote, "I found it hard to get anything done while living in a dorm because there was always a lot of noise and confusion." The noise and lack of privacy was especially problematic for freshmen women who were required to live together in special dormitories. One of them said she solved the problem by taking her book into her large closet, fortunately provided with a light. In one sorority some of the girls escaped distractions by using the basement room where their trunks were stored. Fraternities had rules against certain noisy activities during specified study hours, thus, "The fraternity enforced so-called 'quiet hours' rules, whereby no phone conversations were allowed upstairs (where men were studying), no conversations were allowed in the halls, no high-fis could be played. . ." But study hour rules were difficult to enforce. Work space, too, was often inadequate. The residents of Greek houses often had to share a desk with one or two others.

The library system was the one institution within the University complex that was primarily designed for studying. The libraries offered a place to study for many students whose living quarters were unsatisfactory. One girl wrote, "Since the sorority is not always too quiet, I often go to a library at night, and only study at the house during the day. This really studious habit I learned from the girls in the house who make top grades." Her dependence on the example of her prestigeful peers for what would seem to be a self-evident solution to the problem of finding a suitable place to study, is striking evidence of the pervasiveness of social influences on student conduct.

Not all students found the library entirely satisfactory. A married student reported:

> More often than not, the libraries are not ideal places to study, either. If you're near the librarian's desk you will be distracted by conversations. I have often shared a library table with students who perpetually whispered to each other, or with a couple who mumbled sweet things in each others' ears all evening long. The fact that people are continually entering and leaving a library is also distracting. I have found that there just isn't a better place to study than right in our apartment, that is, providing our children are asleep. It's not that there aren't occasional interruptions, but they tend to be less frequent than at the library. . . During the day, when the children are up, I have solved this study problem by finding an empty classroom on the campus and studying there. The only problem is in finding an empty room.

Many of the co-eds did not use the libraries or classrooms for studying at night because they were afraid of the long walk through dark streets. There had been enough cases of girls being frightened or harmed by strange men to deter many of them. Of course, for those who had access to a car, or who could walk with friends, this was no problem.

Some students reported that they found a quiet time to study in the early morning hours while others were asleep. They either stayed up after midnight, or went to bed early and got up at four or five in the morning. Many students reported that, one or more times during their college careers, they changed their living arrangements to get better study conditions. This involved changing rooms, roommates, or place of residence. A boy wrote:

> I decided to live in a room in a private home and see if that would help my grades. I found a room in a home. . . and the people who owned the house were very nice and considerate of my situation. The husband worked the graveyard shift, so I had plenty of peace and quiet. My grades showed a vast improvement during this year.

But this latter solution was not open to undergraduate women who were required to live under the surveillance of dormitory counsellors and house mothers.

Methods of Studying

After a student finds a place and time to study he needs to develop efficient study techniques. The fundamental problem is that of exercising selective application of effort, as explained by the boy who said that his freshman year was his hardest because--

> . . . I didn't know what people expected of me. . . and, like any situation, after you've been here long enough, it becomes familiar to you, and you begin to know what people expect of you, and [I learned] what I could do and what I shouldn't do, and so, by my sophomore year, I had to work considerably less hard to get the same amount of work achieved than I did in my freshman year.

More specifically, students repeatedly told us how necessary it was to learn ". . . how to pick out the important things. . . ." from the huge volume of reading assigned by professors. In contrast with high school, where assignments were usually memorized, in college it was necessary to learn to read critically and to analyze and interpret what one had read.

Memorizing, however, continued to be a necessary skill of college students. They agreed that it was especially needed in natural science courses, but by no means absent from other subjects. A girl in the honors program said of a humanistic scholar--

> . . . the only thing I don't like is his testing procedure in that you have to just repeat back to him word for word what he has said. . . in my other courses I've always been able to paraphrase what the lecturer says and its really been hard for me to get accustomed to that memorizing. . .

Learning to write, as well as to read, effectively was a problem for many students. It was especially difficult for those whose high school preparation was inadequate, as it was for the boy who wrote, "I had never written an essay answer in high school and no more than three themes. All of our tests were objective. . . I couldn't organize an essay-type answer that covered a broad subject. . .

Self-Discipline

It was the opinion of many of the students we questioned that studying required unusual self-discipline. As a girl who made the honor roll put it:

> I worked harder last semester than I ever dreamed I would have to. I found that my satisfactory high school study habits were not quite so satisfactory for college. The self-discipline which is required of a college student is almost unbearably difficult to acquire at first.

Self-discipline was exercised primarily by choosing to spend time studying rather than doing immediately gratifying things, and, secondarily, to study subjects where knowledge was most needed rather than those that were most interesting. A student with high aspirations needed a great amount of ascetic dedication to reach his goal. The academic enterprise requires a larger measure of the traditional Protestant individualistic virtues than modern, bureaucratized business.

An unusual combination of legitimate devices for solving study problems were employed by a girl in our sample. She arrived on the campus with all the signs that portend success and, one might naively assume, an easy time in college. She had been awarded a top honor scholarship, received an invitation into the honors program, and she scored in the 99th percentile on the A. C. E. Psychological Examination. One flaw in her record was a score on the mathematics placement test in the 30th percentile. She told us she learned in college to get along with less sleep, she bought a hot plate to avoid the necessity of going out of the sorority house for late snacks, she strove to increase her reading speed, and she used ear plugs to block out the chatter of her sorority sisters. Before enrolling for a required, elementary mathematics course, which she postponed until a year before graduation, she took a similar mathematics course by correspondence. Despite all her efforts and ingenuity she lost her honor scholarship after her g.p.a. declined and stayed below the 3.5 level.

To complete the picture of this girl who exhibited such ascetic dedication to scholarship, it should be added that she was no recluse. The yearbook listed twenty different activities and awards under her name, yet she never complained that they detracted from her academic development.

Enrollment Manipulation

Students lightened the burden of studying by manipulating the program of classes in which they enrolled. This was done legitimately by choosing easy electives and by taking the minimum number of class hours allowed under the rules. A few hours of correspondence courses could be counted toward graduation. Hard courses, such as certain natural sciences, required for admission to Medical School, were often taken at one of several neighboring colleges during a summer session or even a semester. We uncovered some cases of outright evasion of course requirements, and suspected that a lot more of it went undetected. An example from our sample, that we guessed was typical of many others, was that of a boy who enrolled in a professional school in his junior year after the required two years in the School of Letters and Sciences. The professional school did not require a foreign language for either admission or graduation. Although the School of Letters and Sciences required two courses in a foreign language during the freshman and sophomore years, this student succeeded in avoiding enrollment in the second course--perhaps with the acquiesence of a sympathetic advisor. Though none of our informants admitted altering their enrollment cards without approval, some of them told us they knew of other students who made unauthorized changes after obtaining their advisor's signature.

One might assume that the less legitimate of these techniques of enrollment manipulation were resorted to only by weak students, but this was apparently not the case. Bright collegians, who were concerned about holding on to their scholarships, or pre-professionals striving to meet high admission standards, seemed just as culpable as the average student. It is entirely possible that these evasions were related more to aspiration than to low performance, whether they were motivated by striving to get off probation or into Phi Beta Kappa.

Although enrollment manipulation was almost universal among the students, there were countervailing pressures from their peers as well as from the academic administrators. Hard courses, that required a great deal of study, had high prestige among students. On the other hand easy courses, usually called "puds," that could be passed largely on the strength of common sense and general knowledge, were held in low regard. The higher the grade you could get without studying, the lower the prestige of the course. A bright freshman told an interviewer that his friends kidded him and he was embarrassed to be taking an elementary mathematics course. A factor in a student's self respect and his standing among his peers was the prestige of the courses he had taken.

The low regard for some popular, pud courses was implied in derisive nicknames given to them. Their reputations, however, did not always match current practice. Students reported that they enrolled in, what other students assured them were easy courses, only to find that they had been misinformed or the professor had "beefed up" his course.

The social pressure of peer opinion against enrolling in an excessive number of easy courses was effective against the brighter students who cherished their reputations as scholars. Average and marginal students had no reputation to maintain or they were desperate enough to risk tarnishing it. Thus, in order to understand his conduct, it is necessary to know the student's conception of himself as a scholar, and the role he wants to perform in relations with others who are significant to him.

Beating the System

As a consequence of the emphasis on grades, and the potent sanctions in the form of positive rewards for high grades and negative deprivations for low grades, there was enormous pressure on students to use short cut methods to get satisfactory marks. The techniques varied in legitimacy from those like cramming, that were not considered wrong, to cheating on an examination. They had the common characteristic of enabling the student to raise his grade without the amount of disciplined, systematic studying that would otherwise be necessary. They were ways to succeed in school without really studying. Although there was no prevalent term for beating the system a boy in our sample called it "sandbagging." He explained it as follows:

> If you're not actually trying to get a whole lot out of the course, I think you can sandbag quite a bit, after you get to be a Junior or Senior, and if you aren't interested in learning something in the course. (Interviewer: What do you mean by sandbag?) I mean you learn where you have to do your work and where you don't have to do the work, and you end up doing half as much and getting the same grade or better.

This admittedly successful practitioner of sandbagging got on the Dean's Honor Roll four times and graduated with departmental honors.

Probably the least reprehensible of the nonstudying techniques for making grades was that of outwitting the instructor. A boy described the method he worked out for answering one professor's objective questions:

> I remember going over one of my old tests and figuring out a system to answer true-false questions. If I absolutely knew the answer, naturally, I would answer accordingly. However, if I felt that the statement was obviously true, then I found that marking it false would be the correct answer most of the time.

A strategy for essay examinations was reported by another boy who recalled:

> I did have trouble during my freshman year in studying for essay-type tests; but I solved that problem when I realized you have to outguess the instructor and outline the main points or questions he is likely to ask instead of trying to learn everything in the book.

Help in appraising the professor's interests and preferences was sometimes obtained from friends who had previously taken his course. However, the informal communication network, better known as the grapevine, was not well developed at S. U. It seemed to consist of numerous networks within separate groups that had little connection with one another. This store of accumulated oral knowledge about professors and courses was a part of the student subculture, but such information was not extensively used because it was incomplete and unreliable. No doubt the changing content of courses and the turnover of teaching personnel reduced the value of grapevine information.

A widely used tactic for minimizing work was that of coasting on one's reputation. A senior in one of the fine arts explained:

> . . . both my brother and I have discovered. . . that by having spurts of work you can run on a reputation for some time. When I was a sophomore, I received an award; when I was a junior I received an outstanding student award, and this carried me about two semesters, I would say. Of course, I did work and did the best I could, but the amount of it could have been more.

A somewhat similar tactic was used by a girl for required courses in which she had no intrinsic interest. She said, "I finally realized that if you start off and get your first nine weeks with good grades, you can slide through until the last three weeks of school and then cram and come out with the same good grades you had at the first of the semester." However, there is no certain evidence that her method was successful since she was placed on academic probation and transferred to another state university where she graduated.

Cramming for examinations seems to have been resorted to by very nearly every student we questioned. For most of them, it was an emergency measure, resorted to when unusual circumstances prevented more methodical preparation. But some applied it systematically as did the junior girl who explained:

> I am terribly below average in reading speed and comprehension. With all reading courses I have had a hard time getting my studying done. The only solution I have found, so far, is to study way into the night and sacrifice certain courses for others. I am fortunate in that I can cram fairly successfully, and, while studying for one exam, I sacrifice all others, then I sacrifice that course in preparing for another. . . My main objection to my method is that I learn very little. I get through the test and forget all but a few particulars. . .

Since she made the Dean's honor roll five times, the method apparently paid off for her.

The use of locally published notes as a study aid was limited at S. U. to one subject. It was the required course on Western Culture, which was basically a reading program supplemented by weekly discussion sessions. Several years ago a couple of enterprising graduate students, who had been discussion leaders for the course, mimeographed a set of notes on the readings. They proved such a commercial success that revised editions have appeared annually, and are regularly advertised in the campus newspaper. A boy who was elected to Phi Beta Kappa in his junior year, reasoned that Western Culture should not be a required course because those who are not interested study the notes instead of the actual books and therefore learn very little.

Most, if not all, of the Greek-letter organizations and small residence halls, maintained files of past examinations, papers, and laboratory reports. Many of the students we talked to had consulted these files, though they used them in various ways.

A boy declared that he found the files of examinations in his residence hall a big help, especially when he was a freshman. A fraternity member said that, although the files were of no help for essay examination questions, they were a virtual necessity for laboratory reports in a science course. A student, he explained:

> . . . will take the best one he can find in the file and make what improvements he can on it and then, when he gets his back, he will put his in the file, assuming, of course, that he got a better grade than the one that was already in the file. Along with these improved files, the Zoology Department has been improving it's standards to the point where a student without those files is really at quite a disadvantage now.

In the opinion of a student in the honors program, they were also useful for problem type examinations, but no help in humanistic subjects. He concluded:

> I don't think you could get anything out of them if you haven't already studied the material. They are not a short cut to getting a good grade. They are just a help in learning a few more things or a help in giving you another look at what you need to know before you go into that exam.

The large number of semilegitimate means of coping with study problems are not clearly right or wrong. They are less reputable alternatives to the ideal methods of studying. While they were widely used by students, they were criticized by the faculty who tolerated or even condoned their use for lack of any effective way to suppress them. The frequent use of semilegitimate means was a consequence of the high value of the goal, the easy opportunities for using them, and the lack of negative sanctions.

Since many of the techniques for beating the system required the co-operation of other students, here, if anywhere, there was evidence of a student subculture. But these techniques were not compulsory; rather they were merely alternatives to the ideal methods of learning that were approved by the faculty. Many of the semilegitimate means were provided by the residential units. Fraternities furnished more than dormitories, and those who lived in rented rooms had the fewest facilities. Among students with similar opportunities, the extent to which they availed themselves of the less reputable means was presumably a result of an individual decision determined by the relative strength of his own moral scruples and the importance of the objective.

Cheating

Cheating, although it was the most reprehensible method of making a grade, in the judgment of students as well as faculty, was widely used. Attempts were made, rarely with success, to break into faculty offices to steal copies of examinations. Apochryphal stories circulated, especially at final examination time, about ingenious schemes for cheating. Like the folklore of simple peoples they seemed to bring gratification through fantasy rather than functioning as a practical guide to action.

There were varieties and degrees of cheating that shaded off into practices that lay between the ideal ways of studying and the obviously dishonest tricks. It was not always clear whether a particular act was cheating or not. Students disapproved of cheating in principle, but recognized exceptions in practice, as was the case with a student in the honors program who said:

> I can't think of any courses where I thought cheating was justified. At least my own cheating. I'll admit that once on an exam I helped a friend of mine, but he was really worried about his performance on a test. . . he wanted to make a _B_ instead of a _C_. . . . at the end of the exam he needed a couple of answers so I

> gave him a couple of answers. . . . but I didn't feel guilty about it. I didn't see why I should. I suppose I should have felt guilty. If I had been cheating or looking at someone else's paper, then I might have. (Interviewer: Have you ever done that?) Not intentionally. But sometimes you can't help seeing the other person's paper.

He obviously felt some mental conflict over the inconsistencies and ambiguities of his beliefs and conduct. He seemed to be saying that cheating was wrong, but it is all right to help a friend do something dishonest, and one can't be blamed for unintentionally seeing someone else's examination paper. He didn't feel guilty, but thought that he should have. Another boy, who asserted that cheating was not justified, added however, that it was justified if the instructor was incompetent, or if it was done in an easy course deliberately taken to avoid work. For these boys, as for so many students, the norms of conduct were conflicting, poorly defined, and inexact in their application.

The students in our sample who were enrolled in the spring of 1963 when most of them were in their fourth year, were asked questions about cheating (see Appendix A, sixth interview, question III, 1, 5). One-fourth admitted they had cheated sometime in college; two-fifths said they had never cheated; and one-third gave evasive responses, or asserted that cheating was never justified, without actually saying they had never cheated (see Appendix B, Table 47). Since interviewees usually conceal or understate illicit conduct, it can be assumed that the proportion of admitted cheaters is a minimum estimate of the actual proportion, and many, if not all, of those who gave evasive responses had also cheated. Hence, the actual proportion of cheaters in our sample was probably somewhere between a fourth and one-half.

The distribution of responses to the questions on cheating by honor students was similar to that for ordinary students. Apparently their superior academic ability was not associated with superior ethical standards. One might assume that the honor students would have less need to cheat, but apparently they were subject to just as much pressure as other students and found just as many opportunities to cheat.

Conclusion

There were a variety of ways available to students at S. U. for coping with problems of studying. If the utopian ideal of a university had prevailed and students were solely motivated by a thirst for knowledge, there would have been no logical motive for anything but systematic, disciplined study; but the existence of the grading system interposed a set of contrived, proximate goals by which their academic achievement was measured.

Depending on social circumstances, students had available to them several means of making grades that differed in their legitimacy. Some disapproved ways were merely frowned on by the faculty, but others violated explicit rules. Many practices were in the intermediate zone between the scholarly ideal and the obviously dishonest. Since they were part of a student subculture, largely maintained by the members of organized houses, access to these means were unequally available.

Students used the disapproved means because of the powerful sanctions imposed by the grading system. Positive sanctions included immediate rewards in the form of prizes, scholarships, and honors; and ultimate rewards of more prestigeful and remunerative jobs. Negative sanctions took the form of loss of privileges, the esteem of others, academic probation, and ultimately suspension. These sanctions were effective because the formal procedures were reinforced by informal reactions as manifested in changes in a student's status on the campus and his estimation of his own worth as a person.

Contrary to the view that the existence of a subculture provides a ready-made solution to a common problem,[*] a subculture can create more problems than it solves. The existence of a student subculture aggravated problems of personal adjustment by providing students with disapproved alternative means. Students used them because of the strong pressure for the immediate goal of making grades, while at the same time recognizing that they were valueless for attaining long range goals and were sometimes contrary to their moral standards. The subcultural alternatives generated deviancy in the form of widespread substandard conduct and some offences against the norms.

---

[*] Howard S. Becker, "Student Culture," in Ralph W. Tyler *et al*., *op.cit*., p. 13.

CHAPTER VIII

CLASSMATE INFLUENCES ON STUDYING

The typical classroom at S. U. was a collection of strangers incapable of effective collective action in dealing with their teachers and the problems of studying. This chracterization was especially true from the perspective of freshmen, one of whom said:

> I did not become personal friends with any students and usually I never even knew the names of many of the students with whom I visited [i.e., talked to]. In my classes, I always visited with persons sitting around me, but here, too, I usually did not visit with these classmates outside of class.

A freshman, who participated in the honors program and should have been favorably situated to form friendships, said that the only class in which he made some fairly close friendships was in his small, discussion section of Western Culture, but, he added, even these friends had no influence on him until the second semester.

Rather than help one another, students more often competed for the scarce high grades portioned out by their professor. They were more likely to see one another as rivals than as comrades. Another boy in the honors program said that competition was very keen in his freshman classes, and that he got to know very few of his classmates. This kind of experience, however, was not confined to freshmen. A senior boy wrote:

> I have not found that other people are much help to me in my course work. Others either do not have the time or do not want to spend their free time helping another student. In some respects this attitude is justified, for one can ask himself, 'Why should I help a competitor do better?"

Thus, students enrolled in a class together were often like a mass, in the sociological sense of an aggregation of unrelated individuals, whose attention is focused on the same object, but whose communication with one another is minimal.*

The superficial appearance of a classroom full of students may give the professor the impression that his students form more of a unity than actually exists. The members of the class come together three times a week, sit compactly in ordered rows, and sometimes surreptitiously communicate with one another. The professor may know their names, but they seldom know one another's names, unless they have had some other basis for close association. The situation in large universities is wholly different from elementary schools, high schools, and small colleges, where the same students are together more often, for a longer time, and on more different occasions.

Usually classmates who knew one another at S. U. were acquainted before they enrolled in a particular class. They may have gone to high school together, they may have been members of the same fraternity, or they may have roomed on the same floor of a dormitory. A student who lived in a private residence reflected on his isolation from classmates:

> . . . I make friends very easily. I have a great number of friends of which five or six are very close. Most of my close friends were made through employment rather

---

*Cf. Herbert Blumer in Alfred M. Lee, Ed., Principles of Sociology (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1955), pp. 185-189.

> than college. The only reasonable explanation I can think of for this is that employment leads to closer day to day contact than being in school together. If I had lived in a dormitory or fraternity house this situation might have changed also. School is largely a transient situation where on-campus friends must be altered each semester as new courses are entered.

On the other hand, there were a few students who did say they made friends with classmates, even in their first year, though they seemed to be the exception rather than the rule. Friendships were more likely to develop and lead to co-operation among students who had several classes together. For example, a senior in the Engineering School, wrote, "My relations with my classmates and teachers changed this year. I got to know the people in my classes a lot better and we got together a lot to work on problems that we had to work for our classes." Such associations were reported with some frequency among seniors specializing in the same department, and, as demonstrated below, also among lower-division students enrolled in several of the same honors sections. The formation of personal associations were most favorable in small classes in which there was a great deal of interaction, such as in seminars, laboratories, and studios.

The mass character of the typical classroom at S. U. with its slight development of personal attachments among students is attributable not only to the sheer size and fluidity of the student body, but was also to the deliberate avoidance of close relationships by many students. The heterogeneity of so large a student body drawn from different social classes, religions, ethnic groups, and regions, brought together many persons who would have preferred to keep some degree of social distance between one another. Near the end of her freshman year a girl, who held a top honor scholarship, wrote:

> Since coming to school, I have established few really close friendships. . . this might be due to the fact that I preferred the attitudes and habits of behavior which I had developed before coming to college to those demonstrated by any students that I have so far met here.

This hesitation about making acquaintances was especially evident among new students who realized that early social commitments might tend to fix their status in undergraduate society and make it difficult to make subsequent changes. It was also more marked among women in their relations with men than vice versa. Though both soon discovered, if they didn't know it before, that their social positions were strongly determined by those of the persons they dated, the girls also knew that a woman's reputation, once made, is harder to change than a man's. A coed's role at S. U. was also complicated by the fact that the sororities were not permitted to rush freshmen until the middle of the spring semester, and all freshmen women were required to live in dormitories. Since, as pointed out above, place of residence was the primary determiner of social status among students, this state of affairs left those who wanted to join sororities in a kind of social limbo. The friends they made might have affected their chances of pledging a preferred sorority.

The wariness over forming friendships was seen by many students as unfriendliness or snobbery. A freshman boy recalled his first impressions:

> My first day of classes convinced me that this was going to be something different than high school because classes were huge, I knew nobody, and even worse, everybody seemed unfriendly; but I later learned that this unfriendliness was called sophistication here, so I conformed as much as possible.

Later, as a student gained congenial friends and felt more secure in his social position, he could let down the bars and be more outgoing in his relations with others.

This transition was described by a sophomore coed:

> During my second semester as a freshman, I made many friends in my classes. . . . My second roommate was much easier to adjust to than my first roommate. She is considerably more cheerful and outgoing. . . . I no longer feel that I am withdrawing from society in general or that my roommate, in any way, is hindering my social acceptance.

Although the typical class was a mass of students incapable of joint action, there was some co-operation among the few students who knew one another, as well as some rudimentary collective action that involved most of the class.

Co-operation

Although most students said they preferred to study alone, a substantial minority studied with, or got help from, others. Students often borrowed one another's lecture notes. They got together in pairs or small groups to quiz one another, check answers to problems, or prepare for examinations, as described by a boy who said, "I studied with my other pledge brothers. We got together the day before the exams and went over the material. . . . I think I learned more than I would have studying alone. I found out that if I talk things over with someone else I do better on it." Since he graduated with a B average, it wasn't only the weak student who benefited from sharing knowledge with classmates. A coed who was taking a course in the Law School considered herself handicapped because she was the only girl in the class and couldn't study with the boys, all of whom were dating other girls.

Members of Greek-letter societies sometimes reported giving or receiving help from their fellows. Usually this aid took the form of an upperclassman helping a lowerclassman, or a student who had taken a course assisting one who was currently enrolled. A senior, honor student, who majored in English, told of helping his fraternity brothers with their themes: "English papers--I've never written one for a kid, but I've sure checked a lot of them, marked it up, and told him to go rewrite it, and bring it back, and I'll mark it up again. I've never charged him for it." His remark that he did not ask payment clearly implies that he helped them out of a sense of moral obligation to his fraternity brothers. Incidentally, his opening statement that he had never written a paper for someone acknowledges his adherence to the customary code of academic ethics. In the scholar residences upperclassmen helped the younger ones, but the practice was less frequently reported from the large dormitories where mobility and anonymity were greater.

Many students told us they found it helpful to study with someone else even though they were taking different courses. They chose to study with some particular person whose company they enjoyed and who served as a combination model and disciplinarian. A boy in the honors program described how he and a friend solved the problem of procrastination:

> I had only one real problem--finishing themes and other papers on time. . . . the basic cause in all instances was that I am an inveterate procrastinator. . . . My friend Jim and I occasionally form a pact to study together and each sees that the other sticks to it. It's an effective measure, but we use it only to catch up.

Together they kept each other from wasting time. Boys and girls often had "study dates." The presence of someone of the opposite sex seems not always to have been distracting, as reported by the girl who graduated _summa cum laude_: "During two of my semesters up here I have been helped by dating boys who needed to study. We would study at the library from time to time during the week, and then study all evening one night a weekend." Apparently a good many students found that they could study better in the company of a friend similarly engaged. Since each played the role of a model and conscience for the other, they were able to accomplish more together than alone. It could aptly be termed a form of parallel work, analogous to parallel play among small children--a form of very elementary collective behavior.

These various ways in which students co-operated with one another on their school work were typically accomplished in pairs, rarely in groups of larger size. Usually they were based on some other relationship such as common residence, friendship, or dating. For the most part the co-operation was an aspect of another role than that of classmate. In this respect, too, classmates were like actual masses in which communication about the object of attention goes on within the primary groups to which participants in the mass belong.* The concept of the mass as composed of completely atomized individuals, who say not a single word about the thing that attracts their interest to any other person, no matter how intimately related, is an ideal type that does not exist in reality. Since communication in a mass goes on within separated primary groups, and does not extend to larger groups and organizations, a mass is incapable of co-ordinated collective action.

Collective Action

Students not only joined with their peers to solve certain problems that arose in studying, they also acted collectively to avoid problems, and stabilize the conditions under which they studied. Among things of this nature reported by the students at S. U. were the communication of information about courses and professors, control of students who studied too much, and control over professors who wanted them to work too hard.

The "curve breaker" among students at S. U. was the counterpart of the "rate buster" among factory workers. This phrase was probably as widely known and precisely understood as any other term in the student's vocabulary of slang. A synonym was "curve bender." These epithets were applied to the student who made such high grades on examinations that the instructor was believed to upwardly revise his grading standards. The curve breaker was the villian in the classroom drama; though, it should be added, he was a hero to his professor. One response to the curve breaker by his classmates was described by a junior who wrote, "I have noticed in classes on the campus that some people who normally will give you notes on a lecture that you missed, will refuse to do so if you score so high on a test as to become a "curve breaker."

The attitude toward the curve breaker, however, was not simple hostility, for, at the same time that he was disliked, he was also envied. Those who made high grades were respected. They were recruited by fraternities and sororities to raise the prestige of the organization. Feelings about him were ambivalent. In general, bright students were highly regarded. They were resented, only episodically, by those who found themselves competing for grades in the same class. Even then, most students used the epithet more in a joking spirit than seriously. As an expletive, it functioned more often to relieve intrapsychic tensions generated by competition than to intimidate the person so designated. It was not an effective device of social control.

We were unable to find any examples of coercive, negative sanctions applied to curve breakers. No one reported suffering from ostracism or even mild shunning for making high grades. Even if no one admitted being punished in this way, it would be expected that curve breakers would have fewer friends than other students. But, when students in the honors program, who can be assumed to be habitual curve breakers, were compared with the others in our sample, there was no difference in the proportion having many or few friends. In both categories, about half were judged to have many friends (see Appendix B, Table 34).

---

*J. B. Ford, "Primary Group in Mass Communication," Sociology and Social Research 38 (January, 1954), pp. 152-158.

Another form of unfair competition in the classroom was practiced by the "apple polisher." This term, or one of its obscene synonyms, was applied to the student who tried to raise his grade by cultivating the good will of his professor instead of studying. It was believed that the apple polisher hoped to get more favored treatment by feigning deep interest in the course, and by personalizing his relationship with his teachers. The term implied that he was putting on an insincere classroom performance, but it was applied to students regardless of their inner motives. The term implied that the student-faculty relationship should be formal and distant, and anyone attempting to make it informal and close was violating a norm of the student subculture.

A sophomore who had internalized, and was governed by the attitude reflected in this epithet, explained:

> I don't consult with my teachers about class problems. I usually try to work them out myself. This feeling of having to be independent springs from a high school dislike of "apple polishers." I have always disliked the idea of being graded-up for apparent interest. This idea I realize is a poor [i.e., inaccurate] appraisal of the actual situation here at S. U., but it will take a while for me to feel free to go to my teachers.

More significant for our understanding of college students than her negative feeling about currying favor with teachers, is the fact that she thought her attitude was a carry-over from high school that was not entirely consistent with the conduct of more experienced university students. From her point of view, her behavior was governed, not by an existing subculture of student norms, but by habits internalized from experience in the high school subculture that she had left almost two years earlier.

Another sophomore, although she was aware of the negative attitude toward currying favor with teachers, ignored the tradition. She wrote:

> Last year I liked, and got along well with all my teachers. Some of them I enjoyed staying after class and talking with, even at the risk of being termed an "apple polisher." I developed friendships with several of my teachers that have lasted even though I am now out of their classes. Every once in a while I stop by to see them and to talk with them. This is similar to my relationships with my superintendent and some of my teachers in high school.

She, too, continued to act in college according to the habits formed in high school.

When college students respond to problematic situations according to attitudes acquired elsewhere, one must conclude either that there are no distinctive subcultural norms generated in the student body for this situation, or that the norms, though present, are too weak, or held by too small a number of students, to influence the behavior of very many students.

Restriction of Output

From industrial studies, it is well known that workers tend to limit their production to a level below the maximum of their capability. Such restriction of output has been interpreted as functioning to reduce competition within the work group, thereby increasing the stability of the group on the one hand, and the security of its members on the other. A similar phenomenon has been found in colleges. Medical students arrived at a common understanding of the number of case summaries they wrote.*

Among S. U. undergraduates we found very little evidence of collective action. We asked our panel, during the semester in which most of them graduated, about their experiences in classes where they thought the work was excessive (see Appendix A, Sixth Interview, Part III, Questions D and E). Virtually all of them agreed that they had been in classes where they thought the professor demanded too much; but they differed in their reports of what was done about it, from nothing, to fairly effective measures. A premedical senior in the honors program told us he knew of no collective protest to an instructor, though students often complained to themselves or their friends. In one course he registered an individual complaint. He said there were times when he talked with other students about the length of their term papers, but his classes were usually too large to discover any consensus, and he thought this rarely influenced his own work. Another boy thought the prevalence of rate busters made such collective attempts unsuccessful: ". . . there are usually one or two students who are willing to put in a little extra to try to get a better grade, and they are not going to limit themselves."

A further weakness in accomplishing work restriction, was in getting the participants to live up to their agreement. A girl, who held a top honor scholarship, pointed this out:

> I've been in classes where people have tried to do that, or say they're going to. Maybe three or four people in a group in a class will do that, but I don't think that it really helps them because. . . when it really comes down to studying, you really do a lot more than you admit.

In her experience, such understandings were reached by a small minority of the class, but even they couldn't be counted on to observe the agreement. If there was a student subcultural norm for restricting work, it was too weakly sanctioned to prevail over the social pressures (constraints and incentives) to adhere to the formal culture of the university.

As a sorority member, the coed just quoted as saying that students work harder in the privacy of their rooms than they admit to one another in class, is consistent with the attitude we found prevalent among Greeks, that one should make high grades, but not appear to work hard doing it. Assertions about limiting work may be part of the pretense that goes with performing the academic role in the presence of peers; but when the student is "backstage" studying to prepare for his classroom performance he may drive himself to full capacity. On the other hand, it is possible that the informal talk among classmates about how much work they intended to do, had more of a regulating effect than they realized, but we had no way of proving it. It appeared more likely that students acted according to the belief they expressed to the interviewers, that there was more idle talk about restriction of work than was actually practiced.

Although in general we found little evidence of output restriction, we were told about a few clearcut instances. A student, who majored in an applied art, described one example:

> He [the instructor] assigned a problem and told us it was due the third week, and we turned it in. Then he assigned another and never gave a date. . . . it was a

---

*Howard S. Becker, _et al_., _op. cit_., pp. 303-305.

> hard problem to design. . . It wasn't a problem that would take a whole semester, probably only about four weeks to do; but the students. . . got together in a group and decided that we should really take our time on it, no matter how long it took, and really do a nice job, and maybe we won't have another problem.

However, the tactic was not successful for he went on to say that the instructor surprised them by assigning another problem near the end of the semester. In all the cases we found of effective output restriction, the class was small, and, in some instances, the members had also been together in other courses.

A form of collective work restriction that is more elementary than informal agreement was reported by one member of our panel. He said that in most classes taught by professors who gave a heavy assignment, ". . . the kids will pick the most gung-ho* person and do just a little bit less than they will." His remark implied that the members of a class took the performance of a recognized leader as their standard, and were careful not to exceed it. It could aptly be called "work leadership" from its resemblance to price leadership among business men. This kind of collective solution was at all prevalent. It presupposes consensus on the identity of the leader, and knowledge of his productivity by all of the class--conditions which were not common at S. U.

An alternative to restricting output as a way of coping with burdensome assignments was co-operation in getting the work done. An example of this mode of adjustment was reported from a professional school where classes were small and students were together in several subjects. A member of our sample was one of the students in a class that thought they were being extremely overworked. After a protest to the Dean was ineffective, they discussed the problem in another class, in the presence of a professor, and decided that, rather than refuse to do all the assignments, and risk flunking the course, they would work co-operatively. They divided into five groups, each of which worked on a different assignment.

When applying the concept of output restriction to students, it should be kept in mind that the analogy between the classroom and the workshop is far from perfect. The professor, unlike the boss, is not unreservedly enthusiastic over maximizing the productivity of his students. Although he is delighted to have them read and think as much as possible, he has mixed feelings, if he is not firmly opposed to frequent tests and written exercises. All of these products of scholarship mean tedious hours of work for him. Most students were aware that their teachers were happy to have them limit the length of their papers. Students differed from workers because they often want to do more work of certain kinds than the professor asked of them. This attitude was evident in a class in which the professor called for a vote on the number of examinations, and a majority of the students favored frequent tests. Most students preferred to make their grades by taking examinations than by classroom performance. Apparently, they felt more secure about their academic standing, and believed they had more control over the outcome. It was very common for weak students to privately ask their instructor to permit them to do extra work in order to raise their grade.

The grading system generated strong incentives to produce tangible things, like reports and examination papers, as a basis for assigning grades. Their instrumental character is implied in the common choice of the verb make that students apply to grades. The use of grades tends to intensify competition. The system functions the way a piece-rate system is supposed to work in a factory. Why weren't these students more successful in sabotaging the formal system, the way most factory operatives are? Our data suggest that the answer lay in the low level of integration among classmates. They were together only three hours a week instead of forty, and for only one semester of sixteen weeks instead of years. They were of both sexes and diverse social backgrounds in campus society as well as in their home communities. Since most of them remained strangers to one another, they were incapable of effective collective action.

---

*This slang adjective was applied to persons who work hard at something because of their dedicated enthusiasm for the subject.

Control of Professors

Students generally saw efforts to control their professors as futile or ineffective. They may have had more influence on teaching practices than they realized, but to find out, was largely beyond the scope of this research.

The attitude of futility toward efforts to control the conduct of their teachers was based on experience, and was consistent with their general attitude toward professors as distant, powerful, and authoritarian. We failed to turn up any instances of students in lower division classes telling their professors that the work was excessive or too difficult. We asked students if they had ever gone to their instructors to complain about their assignments. A revealing response was:

> No, I've always felt that the instructor is or ought to be intelligent enough to know how the level of work that he expects compares with the number of hours credit offered in his course. And I've felt that if it is excessive, he already knows that. So basically, I consider it his business.

A boy, who could only recall student comment in one case and this was in a class where the professor invited criticism, added, "But this is usually not the rule. I think students just complain to themselves or their friends, and not to the teacher." The typical attitude of lower-division students toward pressure for work from their professors was passive, fatalistic acceptance.

A number of attempts at control were reported by upperclassmen, but the students concerned did not perceive that they were effective. A senior described a two-hour course of his in which the instructor gave heavy assignments and difficult tests. He, with several classmates, told their teacher that credit for the course should be raised to four hours. In the words of the student, ". . .he laughed and didn't do much about it. . . . You just have to put up with it." Even if the instructor did do something about it, if not in that year perhaps in the next, the inability of the students to learn the effect of their action would discourage further attempts and lead to a belief that the effort would be futile. It is a well known principle that collective action is much more likely to occur if people expect it to be successful.

Some attempts at joint action, however, were reported from members of advanced classes in which there was a great deal of communication within the classroom. In a discussion class that met in the afternoon, a member said, "[on Fridays] It was understood that past a certain time, no one was supposed to talk. However, if the discussion really gets going, there would be no one in the world to stop it." In an art class, we were told that the students were disappointed over the inadequate criticism of their work, and surmised that the instructor was grading more on attendance than the amount and quality of their work. Our informant recalled:

> We decided that we were just being silly doing all this work when the critique was very poor anyway, and we weren't getting as much out of it as we thought we should, and so we decided we would cut it in half until the critiques picked up, and then we were willing to do more work. . .

In this latter instance, the students restricted their work, not because the assignments were heavy, but in retaliation for the failure of the instructor to do his part, and in the hope that they could thereby coerce him into doing better work.

Conclusion

On the whole, classmate influences on studying and on their relations with professors were minimal. The social influences that determined how much and how hard a student studied came from other membership and reference groups. Chief among these were his family, living group, friendship circles, and anticipated occupational groups. Considerations of status and social reputation motivated many students to maintain some social distance from their classmates, unless they had other ties in common. As compared with work groups in industry, classmates lacked cohesion and were, therefore, less able to act collectively. Exceptions were students who had taken several small classes together. The students in a typical classroom were more like an anonymous mass than a social group, and showed only rudimentary forms of subculture.

CHAPTER IX

THE HONOR STUDENT

On the initiative and leadership of the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences an expanded honors program was established in the middle '50s. Prior to that time, some departments had honors programs for their majors, which were implemented by seminars or tutorials confined to the senior year. The new program, by contrast, began with the entering freshmen on the assumption that valid tests of ability could be used to select the participants, and on the premise that highly capable students might not achieve to the maximum of their capabilities unless special provisions were made for them.

Since a basic feature of the plan was early involvement, participants were chosen before entrance, primarily on the basis of standardized examinations. Those invited to participate were the finalists in a statewide screening for honor scholarships and National Merit scholarship finalists living within the state, provided they had applied for admission to the School of Letters and Sciences. They were referred to as "selected students" or simply "selectees." The honors program, which was never actually given an official title, came to be known as the Selected Student Plan. This analysis of student experience with the Plan will focus on its three major features: (1) special advisors, (2) honors classes, and (3) research participation.

Most of the participants first learned about the plan when they received the invitation to enter the program from the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences. The letter, mailed during the summer preceding their enrollment at the university, briefly explained the nature of the plan. During orientation sessions before the start of the semester, a separate meeting was held for all students invited into the program, at which the Dean personally explained its operation and answered students' questions. A pamphlet, distributed to students at that time, described it as an important plan for a small number of freshmen and sophomores. The pamphlet explained that their advisors would be members of the Policy Committee of the School of Letters and Sciences who are empowered to design a challenging plan of studies appropriate to the ability of the student without regard to existing regulations and practices. It also described the special honors classes in most introductory and required subjects as small and taught by senior professors.

The reactions of students to the Selected Student Plan is presented below according to the usual sequence in which the student became involved in the program. Accordingly it begins with his reactions to his advisor, proceeds to his experience in honors classes, his work as a research assistant, his feelings about formal recognition, the responses of peers to his honors work, and finally his concept of himself as a person and a student.

The Advisee Role

The initial choice of a special advisor was the one phase of the honors program over which the student had no control. Those who were invited into the program before enrollment, were assigned to special advisors from among Policy Committee members, and they met with them to plan their class schedules for the fall semester. In 1959 each member of the Policy Committee advised about ten selectees, as compared with the 30 to 35 students assigned to other advisors of lower-division students. Most selectees continued to consult the same advisor during their freshman and sophomore years. At the start of their junior year they chose a major subject, and, like other students, thereafter saw an advisor in the department of their major.

Selectees frequently commented on the pleasant relations they had with their advisors. A boy remarked that he frequently dropped in at his advisor's office, whether he had any specific question to take up with him or not, because he enjoyed talking with him. He wrote that his advisor ". . . became a source of encouragement, inspiration, and friendship." Another boy told of the pleasant evenings he and the other advisees spent at the home of their advisor. The boys seemed generally to perceive their advisors in a man-to-man, equalitarian relationship, while the girls more often held a respectful attitude as though toward someone in authority. A girl said of her advisor, ". . . he's really wonderful. . . . He's so busy, but he was so sensible and kind; I really liked him. . . ." as though describing an idealized father image. Another girl who related to her advisor in a daughterly way said, "My advisor is really nice. I was pretty blue after about my first six weeks of school and he kept kind of boosting me over the humps. I think he had more influence than anyone."

Most of the selectees and their advisors quickly established a friendly, helpful, and in many cases, even personal association. With the boys this tended to take a fraternal pattern while with the girls it was more often filial. The relationship contrasted with the bureaucratic pattern of the ordinary student's contacts with his advisor.

Outside the relationship with the officially designated advisor, some students received informal advice from administrative officers and from professors in whose classes they were enrolled. A freshman boy said, "I talked to the Dean at summer orientation. He's the one who got me interested in this anthropology course I'm taking. . . . I think it's really good if you know the Dean is on your side, and that he knows you and everything." The sensitivity and skill of a department chairman, who also happened to be an advisor to selectees, was revealed in the following account:

> After about the first week of class of my first semester in college, I became quite discouraged. I was enrolled in Honors Math and was scared to death of the professor and the class, so I decided to drop it and take regular math. When the time came for changing class schedules, I went to talk to the head of the math department about switching. He asked me what my trouble was, and I admitted that I was just plain scared. He told me to stick it out for a week or so more, at least until after we had taken our first exams. I agreed somewhat unwillingly, and got up to leave. As I was leaving, he asked me if I knew a girl named Amy, which I didn't. He told me she had had the same problem last year, and it would probably do me good to talk to her. I left and didn't think anymore about it until several days later when Amy came to see me at the dorm. We talked for a short time about school and various related and unrelated subjects, during which time she encouraged me to stay in my math class. Then she left, leaving me very impressed by the fact that in a school so large and cold (so I believed) the head of the math department would be interested enough in me to ask Amy to talk to me; and that Amy, a complete stranger would come to see me, another complete stranger, just to utter a few words of encouragement. From that time on, my opinion of S. U. began to soften. I stayed in my math class, a thing for which I was later very grateful, for my professor proved to be one of the most interesting and helpful teachers I have ever studied under.

This incident impressively demonstrates the impact of personal concern on the part of a member of the faculty. The lengths he went to by asking another girl to intervene, not only helped the worried freshman solve her immediate enrollment problem, but seemed to have relieved her anxieties and given her attitude toward the University as a whole, a positive turn. Perhaps this department chairman would have acted with equal concern for an ordinary student, but it is unlikely that the chairman of so large a department could give as much time to every troubled undergraduate who wanted to see him. The case suggests that students, who were identified as selectees, received more personalized attention than the others.

The above quotations illustrate the usually warm, friendly, personal quality that selectees experienced in their relationship with their faculty advisors. But not all of the students reported gratifying experiences, as in the case of the boy who, at the end of his sophomore year said of his advisor:

> I've never seen him. He's never around. I had an appointment with him this year, and then he left town on some business and he's never around at enrollment. I've been through enrollment three times and he's never signed my enrollment card yet. I feel that I really should go talk to him because I'm still planning my schedule and this often leads to problems.

But, generally speaking, the selectees more often enjoyed a closer relationship with their advisors than the ordinary students. Our tabulation showed that 87 percent of the honor students described their advisors as friendly, while only 39 percent of the other students did so (see Appendix C, Table 6).

In contrast with this generally favorable picture of the personal aspect of relations between selectees and their special advisors, the working aspect of the relationship was less free of problems for the student. When it came to planning an academic program and counseling students on extracurricular matters, differences of opinion were not uncommon.

The choice of courses, especially when they were outside the student's initial sphere of interest, were an occasional source of disagreement. Sometimes selectees acquiesced in the advisor's judgment as did the coed who explained her enrollment in biology by saying, ". . . the Dean said that cutting up frogs is a vital part of everyone's education, so I took it." This kind of respectful compliance with the Dean's suggestions was also revealed in the comments of a girl on her academic future who said, "I'm planning on graduate school. I hadn't ever thought of that before, but when a man like the Dean has the interest to take a whole hour off of his schedule just to talk to me he's bound to make me think about some new things." Boys, who thought they were being pressured, were more likely to resist, as in the case of one who said:

> My advisor is a zoologist and he's bound and determined to make a zoologist out of me, and I may go along with him for another semester or so. . . . (Interviewer: Did he talk to you about being a zoology major?) Not very much. He told me that he wasn't going to force me to be anything. He was there to help me do anything I wanted. . . .

After trying several different fields this student decided to major in English.

In discussions with their advisors many selectees found that there were other things expected of them besides the formally stated objective of offering ". . . the student a challenging program commensurate to his or her ability," as it is phrased in the leaflet on honors work. They often reported that their advisors expected them to broaden their academic interests, to accelerate their education, to prolong their education, to raise their vocational aspirations, to earn high grades, to participate in worthwhile campus activities, and to think of themselves as superior to other students.

Of these expectations, the one that was the most frequent cause of disagreement between selectees and their advisors was the size of the course load. A sophomore girl recalled:

> First semester of my freshman year I was eligible to take all honors courses and to carry as many hours as I wished. Well, I wished to carry as few hours as possible, and to take as few honors courses as possible, so after a rather trying

> time with my advisor, I got away with enrolling in seventeen hours, including only two honors courses and Western Culture. For almost two weeks I studied constantly, whenever I had free time, and cried myself to sleep every night in utter fatigue.

She succeeded in relieving the pressure by withdrawing from one of her courses, but not without a painful struggle in which she lost some pride for the sake of peace of mind, as she expressed it. Another coed said, ". . . some of the advisors tend to be overenthusiastic; and you know this does spring from a noble source, and they are trying to make the program do what it's designed to do, but they certainly get you overloaded." Notice that this girl did not find fault with the advisors; instead, she attributed their tendency to overload selectees to overenthusiasm for the laudable purposes of the honors program. This charitable interpretation of her advisor's motives tended to minimize stress in their relationship.

Another cause of tension between advisor and advisee arose from enrollment in advanced classes. A girl observed, ". . . I wish I had had more math in high school . . . the course my advisor put me into, I got lost in, and they had to put me back into regular college algebra." She, too, exonerated the advisor from any blame for her problem, and attributed her difficulty to poor high school preparation rather than his bad judgment. Thus a cordial relationship with the advisor was not disturbed.

A boy, on the other hand, aimed his criticism directly at the administrator of the program when he said:

> I'm against being in the honors section of everything. The Dean won't like [my saying this, but] . . . . I question the advisability of thinking that everyone in [the Selected Student Plan] is good at everything. . . . I think that the people who run the program don't always realize that our abilities are limited.

These disagreements over the number and choice of courses were meaningful to the selectees in the sense that they could understand why the advisor wanted them to carry extra hours or take difficult courses; but in some other spheres the advisees could not always make sense of the advisor's attitude. With reference to career aspirations, a girl said of her advisor, "I was hardly up here before he started telling me I should go on for a master's or even a Ph. D. or become an M. D. rather than a medical technologist. And he keeps telling me this, and not paying any attention to what I really want to do." Concerning participation in campus activities, a puzzled junior girl, who had not taken part in activities, said, "I've had a feeling that selectees are sort of expected to be in lot of activities. . . It seems like they expect you to do more than just study." But another girl, who detected disapproval of her choice of activities, said, "There was a kind of disagreement between the Dean and I. I don't feel that he approved very much of my activities. . . . Seems like he thought that he had a scholar, but what he really got was an activities girl."

Although we heard many assertions of disagreement with the ideas and opinions of their advisors, the selectees, far more than the other students thought their advisors were knowledgeable and helpful in choosing and scheduling courses. Eighty-six percent were of this opinion, as contrasted with only 33 percent of those not in the Selected Student Plan. None of the selectees in the sample thought they had gotten harmful advice or misinformation from their advisors while 23 percent of other students said this (see Appendix C, Table 7).

In summary, it appears that most selectees had a gratifying relationship with their Policy Committee advisors that was only occasionally disturbed by conflicting purposes. They saw their advisors as knowledgeable men, eager to help, and usually interested in them as whole persons as well as students. Selectees found that their advisors performed their academic and personal roles in a way that was adaptive and satisfying to the advisee in pursuing his educational objectives. But, outside the academic sphere, the selectees often found their advisors' attitudes vague and puzzling. They received praise for engaging in some activities, but were discouraged from wasting their time on others. How to distinguish the worthwhile from the unimportant was often unclear to the students. His understanding of student life outside the classroom seemed inconsistent with the student's own conceptions, and made him an unreliable guide in extracurricular affairs. They found that they could not accept with unquestioning faith all that their advisors suggested or expected. They saw the advisor as directed not only by the needs of the individual student, but also by the objectives of the Selected Student Plan, and, in striving for these, he often placed greater expectations on his advisees than they felt capable of handling. The advisor's role as a member of the Policy Committee of the School of Letters and Sciences, with a commitment to implement a program for selectees that would approximate an ideal honors program, biased his judgment in the direction of an exaggerated conception of the student's ability to handle a heavy load of difficult courses.

The Classroom Role

Selectees were encouraged by their advisors to enroll in the honors sections of introductory and required courses. These classes, however, were open to other students with high grades or high scores on aptitude tests. For example, students who had been listed on the Honor Roll of the School of Letters and Sciences the preceding semester, because their grades placed them in the top decile, were admitted without special permission of the professor. As a consequence, selectees were only a minority of the persons in honor sections.

Although selectees were encouraged to enroll in honors sections, these rarely comprised a student's entire program. Not every department offered honor sections, many advisors did not encourage a full program of honors sections, and students often objected to taking more than one or two honors courses. However, the Policy Committee advisors agreed to place all selectees in the honors sections of freshman composition and literature, and as many as possible in a reading course on Western Culture that ordinary students took in their sophomore year. Both of these courses were required of all students in the School of Letters and Sciences.

The selectees, of course, took many more honors sections than the other students, in proportion to their numbers. All of the ninety-four selectees in the 1959 cohort took at least two honors courses, while only one-fourth of our sample of ordinary students enrolled in one or more honors sections. The selectees averaged eight honor sections, while among the ordinary students, who took at least one honor section, the average was two. Since students take about eighteen to twenty-two courses during the two lower-division years, over a third of the work of selectees was in honors classes.

Student's reactions to the honors sections of introductory and required courses dealt mostly with the content of the courses, the quality of the instruction, and grading standards. Their judgments and feelings about content were, of course, extremely varied, though some recurrent attitudes could be discerned. Honor students invariably had good things to say about the special English classes. A girl's typical comment was, "I realy enjoyed taking honors English courses. Many of my friends were taking the regular English courses and were struggling through various little kinds of themes they had to write. I think I probably got more out of the honors English."

A boy who contrasted his experience with that in other courses recalled:

> When I started school here my aspirations were to be a physical scientist, but after taking a sample of honors courses in physics and chemistry, I decided that I wasn't cut out to be a scientist. But on the other hand, after taking honors courses in English, I was. . . encouraged to go a little bit further into literature.

The reading course in Western Culture, which honor students were strongly advised to take as freshmen, was also favorably commented on, though some thought they should have waited to take it in their sophomore year along with other students. A girl wrote:

> . . . the readings, to me, were fascinating. In many cases we read the writings of people I had only heard about before. In some cases the readings supported ideas which I already held, and it always is comforting to know that some famous person in history agrees with you; and in many cases the readings helped me to formulate concrete opinions of ideas which had previously been jumbled in my mind or nonexistent. . .

A gifted girl, who took a contrary view, recalled:

> I was enrolled in Western Culture as a freshman, under the Selected Student Plan, and I didn't have the faintest idea of what the course was about. I studied notes* like crazy for the final, and the material did tie together somewhat. . . I think that if I were to take the course now, as a junior, I might understand it better, but even last year, as a sophomore, it would have been completely beyond my comprehension.

Students taking Western Culture met once a week in groups of about a dozen to discuss their readings with a faculty member. The honors sections were led by senior professors and administrators while the regular sections were handled by assistant instructors who were usually graduate students. Most students in honors sections thought the discussions were stimulating, as did the sophomore girl who wrote:

> This semester I believe that I like Western Culture best because of the subject matter. I am in an honors group and we always get off onto a philosophical discussion. I know absolutely nothing about philosophy, but this class has made me decide to take a course in it next year.

But, contrastingly, the girl quoted above who liked the readings, declared, "The class periods were generally dull and uninspiring."

Complaints that the content of honors sections was too difficult were directed almost exclusively at natural science and mathematics courses. A boy stated:

> I probably wasn't sufficiently prepared for the course. The lecturer was assuming too much knowledge of basic physics on my part, I think. He was lecturing on a much higher level physics, and I just didn't have the fundamentals firmly in mind. It was a very interesting course. I could follow the lectures pretty well, but I just felt that I lacked the basic groundwork. And then the lab instructor was extremely demanding of us, and put a good deal of pressure on us, and it scared me so, that semester, that I just didn't get the work done. It was a very, very emotionally charged semester of physics.

---

*Published digests and commentaries on the readings.

Another boy, who had a similar reaction to his courses in the physical sciences, declared that the professors ". . . simply went too fast and too deep for anyone who didn't really love their subjects--and I didn't." He changed his choice of major from a scientific to a humanistic field.

A boy who had a similar reaction to the lectures, commented favorably on the laboratory--

> . . . we did very interesting things in the lab and I gained a lot more than I probably would have in the regular section. . . . we didn't have a little lab manual which you just read out of, but you really had to work on your experiment and know what you were doing and why you were doing it. It required a lot of work. I spent several hours looking through other books other than our own text. . .

What these students were saying was that aptitude was not a sufficient basis for rapidly proceeding to an advanced level. In addition to native ability, the student should have had a grounding in the fundamental knowledge of the subject, and a strong interest in the field. This kind of criticism was apparently directed at the natural science and mathematics courses, more often than the humanities and social sciences, because of the more systematic, integrated, and cumulative nature of knowledge in these disciplines. Criticism of the reading and discussion course on Western Culture was based on inadequate high school preparation in European History, and insufficient practice in critical analysis.

A practical complaint about the content of an honors section was registered by a boy who said that his work in a mathematics class had handicapped him in subsequent courses for which the course was a prerequisite. He explained, ". . . in my honors calculus a lot of theory was thrown in and stuff that was too advanced for me. . . so I didn't learn to work problems. Now I'm really in bad shape because I need to know how to work calculus for my next chemistry course."

In general, the content of honors sections that appealed to the superior students was that which challenged their analytic and creative powers, rather than merely requiring memorization. A boy who took several honors sections observed:

> I have found that the courses that require no thought are the ones I invariably do poorly in. . . and even though I learn a great deal in these courses I feel that I can learn more in courses that require some thought. Perhaps the best example of this is Philosophy Honors.

Some students stated that natural science courses required more memorization than others:

> I. . . dislike those courses which require that I memorize pages of material, 80 percent of which I shall have forgotten five minutes after I walk out of the test room; but courses which call upon my mind to think, interpret, create, or analyze, are teaching me a valuable process which I will use all my life. I enjoy most science courses when they are challenging, but I dislike the memory part.

The level and pace of the honors sections stimulated many of the selected students. One said of her history class, "I think I got more out of it because I was in there with kids who saw more than I did. I was really lost, and sometimes I felt like I shouldn't even be there, but I did get more out of it." A sophomore selectee responded even more positively to high demands. She wrote, "In my freshman year, Calculus was my favorite subject. It was hard and I had to work to get it. I think that is why I liked it so much." Some students changed from a negative to a positive opinion of the honors courses after experience with other kinds of classes. A senior girl said:

> Now that I've switched to a professional school I begin to appreciate what the Selected Student Plan really is, and I miss it. At first I thought the courses were too hard and that the teachers pushed us too much. I think that I was pretty lazy scholastically then. Now I sort of feel that it was good to be pushed, and it gave me a sense of accomplishment, because I did things that I never would have done otherwise.

We tabulated the reactions of the students in our sample to their school work during the freshman year. They were classified by how hard or easy they thought their courses were in terms of content and competition with their classmates. We found a striking difference between the selectees and other students in the proportion who thought their work was hard: the percentages were 17 and 62 respectively. On the other hand, the selectees did not think their academic work was easy, but three-fourths of them judged it to be neither hard nor easy, or they thought it was a mixture of the two (see Appendix C, Table 8). Keeping in mind that more than a third of the courses taken by selectees during their first two years were honors classes, the small proportion who thought their courses were too hard suggests that the level of instruction was generally within their grasp.

Students in the honors sections found themselves cast in a role in which they were expected to perform at a higher level than in regular classes. They were generally expected to learn more, to assimilate content more rapidly, and to progress to a more advanced stage in the discipline. Furthermore, they were expected to do this without the conventional pedagogic prods of daily assignments, regular exercises, and frequent tests. They were treated more like responsible, self-disciplined adults. The selectees, with few exceptions, as well as most of the regular students in honors sections, carried out the role with fair success. Where their performance was weak, the students generally, attributed it to the instructor's unrealistic assumption as to their prior knowledge, or practice in the application of analytic skills, and not to their intellectual capacity.

The characteristics of the instruction in honors sections that differentiated them from regular sections, in the opinion of selectees, were the more personal relation with the professor, his superior teaching skills, the more interested response of other students, and the greater encouragement of initiative.

A boy, who had taken two honors courses in natural sciences, ventured to explain why teachers were more interested in students enrolled in honors sections than in those taking regular classes. He observed:

> I think that in an honors course. . . you will get to know the professor better. . . . most honors courses are smaller. . . and professors look on you as the people who are going to be here for the next few years and maybe go on and do graduate work. . . and they pay more attention to you and want to learn your name and things, because they expect you to be back in their departments.

He clearly recognized that the system motivated the professor to interest himself in selectees as desirable recruits for departmental specialization and graduate work. Students in freshman-sophomore honor sections who saw that the professor valued them as potential recruits, and who accepted this definition of themselves, experienced a gratifying sense of self-worth that rarely came to students in regular, lower-division classes.

Students thought that the teachers of honors sections not only took more of a personal interest in their students, but also did a better job of teaching. A girl said of her instructor in honors history that he ". . . was one of the finest I've ever had. He so skillfully leads a stimulating discussion that I was influenced to major in history, and I wanted to teach others as he was teaching us." He apparently became the object of sufficient identification to lead to emulation. A different skill impressed a male selectee, in his freshman year, who said that his honors English teacher gave every theme a thorough criticism, and because of it he did better work in his sophomore year.

Some students attributed the high quality of instruction in honors sections to their being staffed by experienced professors, but one student said his honors psychology course was taught by a graduate student ". . . who made a very favorable impression. . ." Nevertheless there were dissenters from the belief that instruction is superior in honors sections. A boy selectee asserted that two honors courses, out of the four he took in his first semester, were no better than the regular sections, and he believed that in some cases the instruction in regular sections was superior to that in honors classes. He may have just had the misfortune of enrolling with some poor teachers; but there is also evidence that he found the method of instruction uncongenial for he later stated, ". . . the type of course I prefer is one where there is no discussion. . . I think what the professor has to say is usually more valuable than what the students can contribute. . . ." His opinion could also have been biased because his performance in the honors classes fell below his aspirations and needs. In his first semester, when his entire enrollment was in honors sections, he earned all Bs; but he had to maintain a 3.5 g.p.a. to hold his Factor Scholarship. He took only one more honors course after that, and in the two following semesters he made all As. His avoidance of honors sections points up a detrimental effect of the grading system. It was so important for this boy to make As that by shunning honors sections he missed what most selectees thought was a very rewarding aspect of the honors program.

The contrasting attitudes of students enrolled in honors and regular sections was described by a boy selectee who compared two successive semesters of language study. He remarked:

> . . . I started out in the regular section and then went to the honors section the second semester. It made all the difference in the world--the first semester I was bored to death. Nobody in the class but me and the teacher--and I wondered about the teacher sometimes--was interested; and I didn't learn very much. But second semester we had an excellent instructor. . . We had interested students, and I learned enough that I was able to skip the next course in sequence after that and go on to the fourth semester course without any trouble.

This difference in the intensity of interest on the part of students was, no doubt, in part a result of the enrollment procedure. Since admission to most honors sections was voluntary for students above a certain ability level, they tended to attract only the most interested and energetic. This self-selection process was revealed in the case of an ordinary student who resisted her advisor's suggestion that she take an anthropology honors course. She admitted to the interviewer that her reason was that she didn't want to write a term paper.

Many students commented with pleasure on the freedom in honors courses, including both the positive opportunities for inquiry and creativity, and the release from the lockstep constraints of mass education. A selectee, who eventually studied journalism, illustrated the freedom for creativity by relating an experience in his freshman English honors class. He had used a sentence fragment for emphasis in a theme and was permitted to do so after stoutly defending it to the professor. He asserted, whether rightly or wrongly, that he could not have done this in a regular section.

Several of these characteristics of instruction are mentioned and interrelated in the comments of a student who was invited into the plan following her freshman year. She said:

> . . . the ones that I've taken seemed to be conducted more on an informal basis and with the idea that everyone in the class is generally above average and can be expected to do more on his own and do more things that are individually interesting to them as far as working on outside papers or topics that are of interest to the students, rather than just setting up a specific syllabus and saying--get this done by such and such a time. . . . I felt certainly more personally involved in the course and I think this improves your feeling that you can get more out of the course because you want to put more into it. You were required to do more thinking on your own. (Interviewer: Do you think the work was harder or easier?) Well, it's hard to say. It may have been harder to the extent that you were required to do more thinking on your own; but this is challenging and this is enjoyable. It wasn't harder. It was, in a way, easier in that there wasn't so much that had to be done in a certain length of time.

Her use of the phrase personally involved points to a crucial characteristic of most honor sections that was rarely present in regular freshman-sophomore classes. It suggests a qualitative difference in the student's motivation between external constraint and internal inclination. Instead of working merely to comply with the instructor's demands, or to make grades and pass tests, he worked because he enjoyed it. It was not only the intellectual content of the course that was more interesting, it was also the pleasure of association with others--students and the professor--having like interests, the stimulation of rivalry, and the matching of wits. It was the social process as much as the individual product that made the difference.* This intensified kind of inner-directed motivation emerged out of the class that became a real group of persons instead of merely a mass of individuals.

There was evidence in our interviews that honor students had strong inner motivation. Those who were classified as exerting much effort, and spending many hours studying were 35 percent of the selectees, as compared with 17 percent of regular students (see Appendix C, Table 9). This difference suggests that the greater freedom in honors sections from external constraints to study, did not reduce the effort the selectees devoted to their studies. There was also evidence that their efforts were motivated by other reasons than the desire to improve their grades, because we found that only 22 percent of the selectees were dissatisfied with their grades while 58 percent of regular students were dissatisfied (see Appendix C, Table 10).

Much of students' thinking about courses was expressed in terms of grades. Selectees who held honor scholarships were especially concerned about grades because they firmly believed that they would lose their scholarships if their g.p.a. fell below 3.5. Although students differed in their opinions about the grading standards used by instructors of honors and regular courses, a majority said it was easier to make high grades in honors sections. This was the opinion of a coed who got a grade of B in freshman English:

> I don't think I would have gotten that in a regular section. My theme writing just isn't that good. . . . I think they grade easier in the honors sections. . . . They think if you were in a regular class you'd be near the top, so they don't grade so

---

*For elaboration of this distinction between process and product, see Robert M. MacIver and Charles H. Page, Society: An Introductory Analysis (New York: Rinehart, 1949), pp. 225-226.

> hard. They overlook mechanics. I was going to drop back [i.e., transfer to a regular section], but I didn't think I could pass. Besides the honors section is more interesting.

A boy explained the easier grading in honors sections by saying, "Well, I think that the teacher is usually more disposed to give *As* and *Bs* in the honors sections since students in there are supposed to be capable of earning *As* and *Bs*." Another boy thought easier grading was a consequence of a closer personal relationship between professor and student. In a natural science course, he was one of fifteen chosen for an honors laboratory. He believed that because the professor knew each one by name he gave them the benefit of the doubt when grading examinations.

From the vantage point of their senior years two boys thought it impossible to generalize about the grading standards in honors sections. One of them said:

> Honors courses are very different up here. In some honors courses they give good grades to everyone because they feel that they are top students. . . It seems as though the ones I got in were graded on the curve pretty much and that way a lot of low grades came out, too.

The other student, after citing different experiences, concluded, "So I don't think there is any really definite pattern. It depends partly on the department, partly on the instructor within the department."

Support for the hypothesis that honors sections were graded more leniently than regular classes was inadvertently provided when we discovered that an ordinary student in our sample was mistakenly enrolled in an honors section of a science course. This happened because it was carelessly noted on his entrance examination score sheet that he was ready to take a course designated *5A*. But his advisor read it as *5H*, and enrolled him in the honors class. We found this one case to be consistent with the hypothesis because he got a grade of *C* in the honors course, but *Ds* and *Fs* in all his other classes.

In summary, it can be said that selectees liked the honors sections better than regular classes because they learned more, the quality of the teaching was higher, they often developed gratifying personal relations with their classmates and the professor, and there was more freedom to pursue individual interests. They also found it easier to make a grade above *C*, though, for some professors, it was harder to earn an *A*. They were better able to master the content of courses in the humanities and social sciences, than in some of the natural sciences and in mathematics, where they often found themselves insufficiently prepared for the high level of presentation. They also reported that the content of science courses sometimes slighted the fundamental principles and methods needed for subsequent work in the same field. They were more likely to speak favorably of the honors sections in retrospection than when they were at the time they were taking them.

Students in honors sections more often became a group as contrasted with the mass character of students in most regular classes for freshmen and sophomores. The smaller size of classes, the higher rate of interaction among its members, and the greater intimacy in their relationships drew them together. Class participation itself was gratifying, irrespective of the reward of intellectual growth, and as a consequence, academic motivation was strengthened.

The Role of Research Assistant

A third important feature of the honors program at S. U. was undergraduate participation in faculty research. Under this scheme students were assigned to individual professors to engage in research under their guidance. They were asked to work eight to ten hours a week, and they received a small stipend and a subscription to a professional journal.

Few students, even among selectees, knew anything about the undergraduate research assistantships prior to receiving one. There was almost no printed information about the program available to students. It was not mentioned in any of the University's publications, except for a brief paragraph in the leaflet on honors activities that was distributed during the orientation and enrollment period.

Most participants first learned about this program when they were told about it by one of their professors. Each spring the faculty of the School of Letters and Sciences were invited to make nominations. Professors contacted promising students and submitted their names to the Dean. A few selectees were told about the program by their Policy Committee advisors, and, if they wanted a research award, were urged to approach faculty members concerning their interest.

A very small fraction of the student body held undergraduate research awards. During the four years in which the students in our panel were interviewed, an average of forty students annually held research participation awards. Even among the selectees, awards were granted to only a minority. Of the ninety-four who entered the University as freshmen in 1959, thirty-three held an appointment during their undergraduate career. Among the 96 in our sample of ordinary students, only one received a research award. The small number of undergraduate research assistants, relative to the thousands of students on the campus, left them socially invisible to their fellows. The role of undergraduate research awardee did not exist in the student subculture.

The expectations that faculty members had for their assistants were revealed in their written evaluations required by the sponsoring agency. Typically the professor expected the student to quickly learn the necessary techniques for research and scholarship, to work independently with only general supervision, and to do creative work that made at least a modest contribution to knowledge. If any of these were lacking the research director was apt to be disappointed.

In addition to learning to do research, the professors hoped the student would learn to value research and scholarship above his other activities, and to like his work so well he would decide to make it his career. Although professors knew this wouldn't happen in every case, if it didn't happen now and then, they were disappointed.

Occasionally research directors developed a personal, as well as a purely professional interest, in their assistant. They encouraged intellectual curiosity about fields other than their own. They were gratified by signs of increasing social maturity, and regretted recurrent adolescent conduct. Assistants sometimes neglected their work when the demands of other roles became pressing. This happened during examination periods, and when term papers were due. The collegiate aspect of the campus, including organizational duties and social life, also sometimes interferred; but, since the faculty supervisor knew his student assistant as a whole person he invariably made allowances for these conflicting demands.

Judging from the responses in our interviews with students who had held assistantships, the research experience had no great impact on a majority of them. They simply commented that their experience had been interesting, enjoyable, or informative. For a minority, on the other hand, it meant a great deal, and marked a turning point in their careers. For three selectees, out of 10 who held awards in our sample of 20, the research assistantship was clearly an important event in their college years. All were girls who held appointments in natural science disciplines. One of them said of her work:

> You learn a lot of techniques that you don't learn in class and you learn to think a lot further than you do in class. . . . (Interviewer: Has it affected your goals in any way?) I don't think I would have considered graduate school as seriously if I hadn't had some experience beyond classwork, and I wouldn't have had the interest that I do now.

For these girls their research influenced their decision to go to graduate school and become scientists. It marked a turning point in their life careers. The fact that the impact of the research experience was more striking in the case of girls than boys is not surprising when it is noted that girls rarely entered college with the intention of preparing for a scientific career. Typically, they planned marriage combined with a minor profession, more often teaching than any other. The choice of a field, usually dominated by men, such as science, a major profession, or college teaching, required in coeds something akin to a conversion experience before they thought of it as a possible career for themselves.

The research experience gave many students a clearer picture of the occupational roles of scientist and scholar. As a consequence some students modified their occupational goals. A boy who had been planning a career in medicine, substituted medical research and teaching for his earlier ambition to be a practicing physician. The research work and close association with mature investigators permitted students to gain more specific and differentiated conceptions of occupational roles within a general occupational field.

Research assistantships provided the student with an opportunity to play a role that closely approximated that of the mature scholar or scientist. He was placed in a setting in which he could try out the role without committing himself to it. If he found the role satisfying, he was encouraged to perform it in as nearly a professional manner as he could. Usually the work brought him into personal association with more mature academicians--professors and graduate students--who served as visible role models for the undergraduate. If the role and the work were not to his liking, nothing was lost. He received the stipend anyway. The honor of having held the appointment was entered on his permanent academic record regardless of the quality of his performance. In these respects the educational process went on in an entirely different atmosphere from that of the usual classroom. Notably, the work of a research assistant was not graded and hence he was free of all the pressures and resulting anxieties that ordinarily plagued students at S. U. Since the work went on in the privacy of a laboratory, library, or office, rather than under the public surveillance of his peers, he was unconcerned over their reactions. He was free from peer group sanctions.

In terms of the dramatic analogy, the role of research awardee was performed backstage rather than before the audience. He made a public appearance only if his work was of unusual merit. A selection of the best research reports were printed in an annual periodical, called Inquiry, which had been inaugurated by the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences for this very purpose. It was edited by students with the aid of a faculty advisor. In a few instances the student's work was reported at the convention of a scientific society.

The influence of personal ties with the research supervisor and co-workers was brought out in a personal history by a girl selectee. She wrote:

> I received the assistantship to work with the Turnbulls on their project on cross-cultural education. At first it was decided that I should interview foreign students. . . . I learned how to listen to people and how to draw them out. During all this time I was treated as an equal by Paul and Ruth. This was a bit disconcerting at first, but later rather enjoyable. I learned a lot about anthropology and anthropological research; and I learned a lot about college teaching and about the S. U. faculty.

She then told about also working with graduate students on the project, and commented:

> This all had the effect of admitting me to a "community of scholars,". . . I became more and more interested in studying and research. Paul and Ruth were very encouraging and very interested in everything. They were always recommending books, fields of inquiry (Paul was determined that I should be interested in the history of science.) . . . They are people of immense energy and enthusiasm.

The personal acceptance of this shy sophomore by a faculty couple magnified the impact of their intellectual stimulation. She found herself thrust into a position of intimacy with faculty members, and accepted as an insider, qualified to share their professional gossip. She occupied a legitimate role linked with the faculty social system, and she became partially assimilated into an academic and professional subculture.

None of the students we studied, who did research in humanistic fields, reported a significant influence on their lives. When asked what he did, a boy selectee answered, "Well, I carried a lot of heavy encyclopedias around all year. . . working on the bibliography. . . a project that I didn't have a great deal of interest in myself. . ." A girl replied to the same question by saying, "I'm not sure. He's writing a book, you know, and I'm supposed to do odd things like help with the bibliography. . . I've been ordering the reference materials and I just do some general typing." For these students, there seemed to be little about their work that was rewarding beyond the stipend. On the other hand, a Bontius scholar described her work in the rare books section of the library during her sophomore year:

> The work I enjoyed, but I found being shut up in the closed stacks for hours at a time very depressing. I decided that I would never be a librarian, in spite of my love of books, nor anything else that required being alone in a laboratory for long periods, not working with other people.

She liked the work, but not the social isolation it required. It appeared to be difficult for humanistic scholars to provide engrossing research for neophytes, and it usually lacked the social reinforcement of team research that characterized the sciences.

Perhaps the very nature of humanistic scholarship is such that it was difficult to provide a place for an apprentice. There was rarely any kind of work of a productive nature given to assistants that enabled them to become acquainted with more sophisticated methods. Frequently the work of the assistant was confined to drudgery that had no meaningful connection with the creative side of his work. Furthermore, the assistant usually did his work in isolation from more mature scholars and, therefore, had little opportunity to find a behavior model or to assimilate the adult, academic subculture.

Students performed their role as a research assistant in a variety of ways. Much of this variation may be attributed to the student's personal definition of his position. The different conceptions that we discerned were: (1) independent, creative researcher, (2) honorary award for past performance, (3) a part-time job, and (4) a scholastic subsidy entailing only nominal duties. Since students entered the program lacking accurate preconceptions, they tended to assume that the award was like something with which they were already familiar, i.e., a scholarship, a prize, or a job. Some of the different student conceptions, of course, co-existed, though as a rule faculty members expected the researcher role to be dominant, and we found no professor who accepted the subvention role as legitimate. The specific combination and relative dominance of these different roles within the position of undergraduate research participant depended upon the expectations brought to the situation by the supervisor and the assistant, and the way they resolved any conflicts that arose. The variability in the role conception held by student assistants may be attributed to the absence of generally understood norms.

In sum, few students were awarded research participation grants, and only a part of these were deeply affected by the experience. Research in the natural sciences offered more possibilities for successful performance than the humanistic disciplines. Professors expected their assistants to quickly learn to work independently and productively. They hoped the work would arouse a love of research and scholarship, and induce some students to choose an academic or scientific career. The more personal the relationship between the adult researcher and his student assistant, the deeper were these influences.

The Public Role

Public recognition was a concomitant of successful participation in the various honors activities. It invariably began during the student's senior year in high school when the local newspaper reported his successful performance on competitive examinations, and announced his awards. It continued on the campus with stories in the student newspaper, reports in the newsletters of student organizations, and publication in the yearbook.

All the students we interviewed were pleased by the invitation from the Dean to take part in the Selected Student Plan. For most of them it was nothing new to have their academic accomplishments recognized. Exactly half of the selectees, who entered the university in the fall of 1959, had been awarded scholarships which invariably received local publicity.

For most of the selectees, the invitation from the Dean was one of a series of signs of formal recognition for scholarly achievement. Others that subsequently came to many participants were: listing on the School Honor Roll, receiving a Research Participation Award, being given a prize from a department or organization, election to a scholastic honor society, nomination for a scholarship, and, finally, graduating _cum laude_.

The importance of these various kinds of public recognition for academic achievement was manifested in the many statements of pleasure, gratitude, excitement, and pride that were made in the interviews and personal histories. Unexpected recognition brought greater gratification than those that were anticipated. A girl selectee explained:

> During the fall semester of my junior year I was nominated by the Mathematics Department and by the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences for a junior year Woodrow Wilson fellowship. . . . I felt very honored at having been nominated. The Mathematics Department nomination especially pleased me since I wasn't on familiar terms with any of the mathematics faculty, and I didn't know that they had so high an opinion of my abilities. . . .

Though for most students, recognition came as a surprise, for some it had been anticipated, and was the culmination of years of striving. An extreme case was the boy selectee who, when asked about his election to Phi Beta Kappa, said:

> . . . when I was a senior in high school, that was the only thing I wanted out of college. . . After I got to S. U. and started making good grades I was more interested in my personal achievement, and in my grades each semester, than working for the Phi Beta Kappa. I could figure several semesters ahead of time I was going to make it. So that when I did, it wasn't much of a thrill. . . It's nice, but I feel like it would just be pretentious to wear a Phi Beta Kappa key around. It just doesn't mean that much.

The last remark touches on a recurring dilemma of the honor student. On the one hand he is pleased by public recognition, but on the other hand he does not want to exhibit his superiority to others. He is caught in the conflict between the basic American values of achievement and equality.

We found one instance in our sample of a student who declined membership in an honor society. He said, ". . . I was elected to the mathematics honor society. I didn't join, however. . . . I didn't see that I would gain anything by joining it. . ." His major was in education rather than mathematics, and he may not have thought the honor was worth the expense of paying dues. Indifference to certain honors may have also been a consequence of their relative value. The tremendous multiplicity of scholastic honors in the various forms of scholarships, citations, awards, prizes, and membership in honor societies resulted in a value ranking, depending primarily on how high the standards were for their acquisition. Despite this informal ranking of different kinds of honors, the lower ranked honors did not become debased and meaningless. A co-ed of average ability was overjoyed when she made the School Honor Roll, while a bright youth was satisfied with nothing less than Phi Beta Kappa. The amount of gratification received from a specific honor varied with the student's aspirations and assessment of his own abilities relative to that particular honor. To make the point by exaggeration, one might say that one student's honor was another student's slur.

A number of students reacted to these honorific awards by feeling a strong sense of obligation. One, a junior girl who was co-opted into the Selected Student Plan, recalled, ". . . I was very surprised over this summer when I was offered an Emma Bontius Scholarship which was. . . an incentive certainly to keep working hard." She seemed to feel that hard work would repay the debt. Another girl, who saw good grades as the quid pro quo, said, ". . . I have this feeling of obligation. After all, I am in the program and I should be making grades that indicate this." A boy selectee, who was awarded a departmental scholastic prize, wrote, "Consequently I really wanted to make a good average, scholastically, so I would show that this award was not wasted on me."

Most of the honors, prizes, and awards that brought public recognition to able students were irrevocable. They were given for past achievements, and could not be withdrawn. Honor scholarships, however, were a very important exception. The Factor scholarships for men and Bontius scholarships for women were described in University publicity releases as ". . . the highest honor that S. U. could pay a State high school senior. . ." But, unlike other awards, they could be withdrawn if the student failed to live up to the high level of performance that the selection committee expected. One-third of the selectees who held Factor or Bontius scholarships between 1959 and 1963 had them withdrawn before graduation. If a scholarship was withdrawn, the student suffered a loss of status and damage to self-esteem. In all cases of withdrawal, the student was given another scholarship which carried the same stipend, but lacked the prestige of the original. But the lack of financial loss did little to mitigate the anguish of losing so prized an honor. The high withdrawal rate found in our sample suggested that the standards were extremely stringent, and the practice of revoking scholarships made them a powerful instrument of control in the hands of the committees that administered the scholarship programs. The majority of those who held honor scholarships were haunted by the ever present fear of losing them. Their anxiety was especially intense during the first few semesters when many students were still unsure of their abilities, they had to take required courses in which some had little interest, and their g.p.a. could be markedly lowered by poor performance in a single course. One youth, who graduated _magna cum laude_ with a Phi Beta Kappa key, said he felt under pressure--

> A good part of the time, especially when I was a freshman and sophomore. When you get to be a junior you have a backlog of grade average built up so that one bad semester isn't going to influence it much; but when you are a freshman and sophomore you have to make a high grade average or you can be ruined in three semesters.

Anxiety for the marginal honor student was prolonged by not knowing exactly when the ax would fall. Some scholarship holders were dropped after one semester below the standard while others were kept on for two or three semesters, presumably because of extenuating circumstances.

A consequence of these administrative policies was to increase the insecurity of honor scholars by placing them in a double bind.* Soon after he was honored by receiving the scholarship, he was threatened with the disgrace of its withdrawal. The reward was accompanied by the threat of punishment. Students may have tried to escape from this double bind by avoiding strong identification with the role. They did not usually think of themselves as honor students, and many of the holders of honor scholarships did not attend the meetings arranged by the supervising committee.

Some students were sharply critical of the high grade-point requirement for retaining the honor scholarships, though others, even among those who lost theirs, saw nothing wrong with the system. When a girl selectee was asked if she had received any awards, she replied:

> Yes, I have, off and on. I was a Bontius Scholar when I came up here, and I finally lost it--just last spring. They were just wonderful to me. They kept me on about two semesters after I hadn't made a 3.5 grade-point average. This really was a disappointment to me, and in myself, because I felt as though I should have done some sort of planning, . . . although I really wanted to be in a lot of activities. . . . (Interviewer: A 3.5 is a pretty high grade-point average.) Yes, but I should have done it [i.e., maintained a 3.5 average]. It's really bad. . . .

Her response revealed some attributes that were common among, if not typical, of honor students. She said _I lost my scholarship_ instead of _they took it away_. Rather than feeling resentment toward the committee for withdrawing her scholarship, she praised them for their lenience. She accepted the policy of requiring a 3.5 grade-point average rather than criticizing it as too stringent. She saw the fault as lying entirely within herself for not planning her work and activities more efficiently. To her, it was _bad_, like a moral weakness, and clearly not attributable to intellectual shortcomings. Thus she maintained faith in the system, its administrators, and in her own mental ability. She had deeply internalized the norms of the institution so that they became her own motives.

---

*Gregory Bateson et al., "Towards A Theory of Schizophrenia," _Behavioral Science_ I (October, 1956), 251-264.

The Bontius Scholarship Committee was not always so lenient in applying the 3.5 rule. One of the selectees chosen in the fall of '59 had her scholarship cancelled at the end of her first semester after she got a D in a five hour course. She made Bs and As in the rest of her 18 hour program and had a grade point average of 2.7. The next semester she enrolled in 20 hours of classes and achieved a 3.5 average.

By no means all selectees accepted the system in its entirety. Typical criticism came from a boy selectee who thought there was undue emphasis on grades, and in his opinion, "The worst offender here is the Factor Scholarship Committee with their 3.5 standard. . . ." Although the Committee never publicized this cut-off point, there was no doubt about it in the minds of students. The only flexibility was in the promptness of its application.

In conclusion, it is evident that the public role of the honor student was a mixed blessing from his point of view. While public recognition brought personal gratification, it conflicted with the code of equalitarianism, and subjected the honoree to social stresses. He felt new obligations to live up to the high standard of performance expected of honorees, and, if he held a revocable scholarship, he felt threatened by a loss of status if it were withdrawn.

In terms of the formal goals of the University and the Selected Student Plan, the public role of the honor student strengthened the system. The granting of honors functioned as concrete proximate goals for the remote intangible goals of higher education. The immediate rewards of prestige were a powerful incentive to high academic achievement. Conscientious students who received honors felt a strong sense of obligation to perform in accordance with the high standards of the role.

Peer Role

Participation in the honors program affected the social position of selectees among their peers. Most students we contacted were aware of some of these effects, though others denied that there were any. Comments centered around two consequences--making friends and social prestige.

Selectees frequently commented on the number of good friends they made as a result of participation in the honors program. A sophomore boy wrote:

> Just before I enrolled, I was informed that I had been chosen to be a member of the Selected Student Plan. I remember, with a great deal of pleasure, the get-acquainted meeting which this group held just before the start of classwork. I met a number of people with whom I later became close friends. . . Since that first meeting, I have had many contacts with the selectees, both in classes and at parties, and I have found them to be, on the whole, people with whom I get along very well. In turn, they have introduced me to many other people, and accordingly, widened the scope of my social contacts. . . .

The small number and size of honors sections resulted in selectees seeing one another over and over in different classes. Several students remarked on the consequence for encouraging friendships, and the contrast with the usual anonymity of students in regular classes. These opportunities for making friends in honors classes were appreciated by independent students more than by those living in fraternity and sorority houses where Greek students usually found their best friends.

Although most students commented on the increased opportunities for friendships by participants in the plan, one student thought that it interfered with the formation of friendships. He believed that the plan created a barrier between selected and ordinary students because of the implied status distinction, and isolation from ordinary students caused by segregation in honors sections. However, it is possible that he was rationalizing his own somewhat artless approach to others.

Some students resisted making friends with other selectees to avoid becoming identified with them. A sophomore girl explained, "I thought that most of the people in my [honors] classes were rather square--the type who do nothing but study." A junior selectee denigrated the intellectual, as well as the social, characteristics of some honor students when he said, "A lot of these people--the kind that memorize things--are the most uninteresting and incapable people on the campus." A Factor scholar, who was elected to Phi Beta Kappa in his junior year, explained that he never attended the dinner meetings for Factor scholars, after the first one, because he didn't want to be identified with the derogatory popular image of the honor student. He said:

> I went to a Factor meeting when. . . I was a freshman and it's the only one I've been to since. There was one boy there that just looked like an honors student. His forehead was about two feet tall and he had thinning, blondish hair. He was getting prematurely bald, he had big, thick glasses, and he. . . brought his brief case along with him, and [he was] kind of short and squatty, too. And that has always been my picture of an honors student. I know he was probably one out of 500 that resembled that kind of picture, but it's that kind of a picture that you always draw up in your mind.

The student who said this, besides making an impressive academic record, served as president of his fraternity and was a leader in campus political organizations, among other activities. Apparently it was very important for him to be popular among his peers, and therefore, to avoid doing anything, which in his mind would detract from his popularity, including associating with honor students.

Students who held an unfavorable image of the honor student and resisted association and identification with their fellow selectees appeared to have a "collegiate" orientation as defined by Martin Trow.* The other orientations that he identified were academic, nonconformist, and vocational. Although we expected honor students to have an academic orientation, our data clearly demonstrated that many did not. One-fifth of our sample of selectees had little or no interest in their studies, and worked primarily for reasons extrinsic to the content of their courses (see Appendix C, Table 11). Among regular students the proportion so characterized was twice as large. Individual selectees exhibited combinations of all four orientations. Those with a strongly collegiate or vocational orientation, that conflicted with a high valuation of scholarship, had an ambivalent attitude toward their role in the honors program.

Although the fraternities and sororities were the principal bearers of the collegiate subculture, they eagerly recruited honor students. As was pointed out above, the most objective and commonly used indicator of the relative prestige rank of Greek-letter societies was their grade-point average. The most obvious way to raise the house average was to pledge honor students. For the honor student, joining a high ranking Greek organization, also added to his prestige, and incidentally, enlarged his opportunities for making friendships among non-honor students. But, like any other bearer of a powerful prestige symbol, he was unsure whether he was wanted by the group for himself or his product. A girl who earned all grades of A, but one, in her lower division years, and had pledged a sorority in her freshmen year, explained

---

*"Student Cultures and Administrative Action," in Robert L. Sutherland *et al.*, editors, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-208.

her dilemma:

> My advisor had mentioned in the spring that my sorority was currently concentrating on scholarship, and was rushing honors students, especially. I was trying to be an all-around sorority girl, and his statement had bothered me increasingly; I was not pleased by the thought that I had been pledged because of my grades, and this was a touchy point for me during my first weeks in the house. I was striving to be accepted for myself and to make myself agreeable. . .

She felt the contradiction between the values of the academic and collegiate orientations, and suffered from having internalized dissonant aspirations for achievement and recognition in both spheres.

The ambivalent attitude of many honor students toward their status may be interpreted as a result of being cast in the academic role, but also wanting to play a collegiate, nonconformist, or vocational role. By accepting the invitation to participate in the Selected Student Plan, he was ascribed to a position in which he was expected to perform like the academically oriented student. Expectations were conveyed primarily by his advisor and his professors, and, secondarily, by his fellow students. Many students fulfilled these expectations and enjoyed doing so. Presumably they were academically oriented from the beginning of their university careers. For those who preferred the collegiate or some other orientation, however, these expectations set up a strain of inconsistency. Their perceptions of themselves were dissonant.

A clear instance of a dissonant response was reported by a senior selectee who recalled an encounter her first day on the campus. She said:

> If you need to think that you're an honor student, then you're obviously lacking in something. . . One girl I met, the first day of my freshman year, when all the girls roamed back and forth finding out about the other ones, walked into my room and said, "Hello, my name is Susan Doe, what's your name?" And I said, "Judy Roe." And she said, "I'm in the Selected Student Plan." Well, this. . . had a very negative effect on me, as if she were using this thing to set herself apart from the rest.

For the girl who remembered this incident, and probably for many others, the dissonance was resolved by accepting the honor student role, in her relations with the faculty, but concealing it from her peers.

Evidence of an ambivalent self-attitude came from the response to the question we asked of every senior in our sample: Have you ever thought of yourself as an honor student? The overwhelming majority unhesitatingly said no. At the same time most of them were flattered by the recognition they had received, and they eagerly took advantage of the opportunities offered by the Selected Student Plan. This was the major dilemma of honor students--to reap the rewards of the program while avoiding the stigma associated with the stereotyped conception of the honor student.

However, too much can be made of this conflict, for, at S. U., the issue was resolved by most students without much difficulty. For most selectees their role as an honor student was but one of many roles, most of which were like those played by the regular students. Many upperclassmen remarked that they had forgotten that they had ever been honor students. Furthermore the strain of inconsistency between their image of themselves as honor students and as collegians was minimized by the anonymity of the honor student role. Outside of fellow selectees and close friends few other peers knew they were honor students.

Conclusion

In some ways the various parts of the honors program operated at cross-purposes and in other ways they reinforced one another. The basic objective of the program--to develop scholars--conflicted with pressure for earning high grades. For holders of certain honor scholarships, the pressure was increased by the threat of withdrawing this highest of all undergraduate awards. As a consequence many students resisted increasing their course loads, and accelerating their educations. They were afraid to take full advantage of the course offerings in honors sections.

The scholastic goals of the plan conflicted with the extracurricular expectations of some of the advisors. Selectees thought they should join student activities and become campus leaders, but these things took precious time away from studies. It was true that advisors wanted their selectees to take part in only the worthwhile activities, but students found it difficult to apply the vague distinctions made by professors.

The efforts of the faculty both as teachers and advisors often conflicted with the needs and goals of their students. In their effort to enrich the content of honors sections, professors, especially in the natural sciences, tended to pitch the course above the level of student preparation, and they also sometimes failed to give the student what he needed for the next course in sequence. Advisors enrolled freshmen in the Western Culture reading course whether or not they were equipped to handle it.

Undergraduate research awards were loosely integrated into the program. They imposed the obligation of allocating an additional ten hours each week to academic pursuits without earning credits toward graduation. Because the award was little known among students and not ritualized, it failed to add prestige to the holder.

An important source of reinforcement for the honors program was the development of personal relations between students and faculty. All three phases of the Selected Student Plan that have been examined--advising, honors sections, and undergraduate research--provided opportunities for students and professors to know one another as unique individuals. Classmetes became a group instead of a mass, and through close association formed satisfying friendships. In the classroom the social process itself became enjoyable, amplified the student's feeling of pleasure in his school work, and motivated him to greater achievement. Personal relations with faculty, whether as learner, advisee, or research apprentice, made it possible for students to imaginatively play the role of their mentors. Through identification with their professors, students internalized the values of higher learning and research. With this new conception of themselves, many, for the first time, seriously entertained the possibility of going to graduate school to become scientists and scholars.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The undergraduate student body at State University in the years 1958 to 1963, was a huge mass of individuals lacking firm overall structure. The formal organization of the University itself provided the only common framework and set of guidelines for all its students. However, the formal categories and groupings of students imposed by the academic system of the institution seldom provided opportunities for establishing strong social bonds. Membership in classes, departments, and honor societies was too fluid and ephemeral for the development of friendships and commitments. Housing groups, on the other hand, were socially significant units. Students were primarily identified by their place of residence, and accordingly categorized in the campus prestige hierarchy. Their closest friendships were usually made with living-group mates.

Among the various kinds of living-groups--fraternity and sorority houses, scholar residences, and dormitories--the Greek-letter societies formed a dominant core. They stood at the apex of the social pyramid, wielded power through controlling most of the important student organizations, and distributing many rewards and privileges. Although a minority of students belonged to fraternities and sororities, they effectively dominated undergraduate social life. The majority of students found themselves handicapped in finding opportunities for full participation in student life. A sharp difference in orientation separated the Greeks from the Independents. The latter generally rejected the Greek system, and attempted to find congenial associations and opportunities for expression in groups marginal to campus society.

The heirachical structure of the Greek system, and its method of membership recruitment by secret selection, gave implicit support to elitist values. The resulting conflict with the equalitarian values, dominant in American society, exposed the Greeks to criticism from Independents, and created a division of allegiance within their own ranks.

The fraternities and sororities were important for the University not only by providing housing for one-third of the undergraduates, and performing important extracurricular rituals, but they also reinforced the objective of academic achievement. An important status symbol was a high house grade-point average. However, the full effect of this support was lost because the emphasis was on grades rather than scholarship.

While peer influence was strong, students were also affected by the opinions and beliefs of their parents. Most students had internalized their parents' attitudes as their own. The majority came from middle-class homes, and a minority were working-class youth striving for a middle-class station in life. College provided a way of confirming or establishing a claim to middle-class status. But the students, and their parents, saw the status function of their education as an aspect of self-development. The thing they valued most in their university experience was the cultivation of social skills, and the formation of friendships. Only a small minority gave first importance to intellectual development, although it was the primary objective of the institution.

The living-groups and student organizations served as mediating links between the complex, bureaucratic structure of the University and individual students. But the dominant Greek system functioned more to serve the status aspirations of the students, and their parents, than their intellectual development or career preparation. The educational objectives and methods of the formal system of the University were modified to better serve the socializing needs and mobility goals of the students and their families. The fraternities, sororities, and the student organizations under their control functioned as the mediating social structure and subculture for the dominant core of students, but the Independents were outside the system and lacked effective mediating agencies. They were a mass incapable of collective action, and lacking a coherent subculture.

Although the classroom was the fundamental unit within the academic sphere of student experience, it was poorly developed as a social group. Classmates were strangers in competition with one another. In the freshman and sophomore years it rarely happened that the same persons were together in more than one class. Enrollment changed each semester. They came from heterogenous backgrounds in their home communities, and from different factions and strata of campus society. Diffidence over cultivating personal ties with classmates stemmed from concern over the consequences for dating and rating. This sensitivity to status distinctions was exaggerated by the Greek system.

The typical freshman student's relations with his professors was characterized by helpless, distant passivity. The traditional high school denigration of apple polishers restrained him from approaching his instructors. He usually took the childish attitude that it was the professor's responsibility, as a parent surrogate, to take the initiative in caring for his students. In time this gulf was bridged by most students who learned from experience that closer personal ties with professors were rewarding, and that the student himself must take some responsibility and initiative in the relationship.

The relations of underclassmen with their advisors failed to provide a satisfactory personal link with the faculty. Students tended to see the advisor only as a fairly knowledgeable bureaucrat. They quickly developed a wariness over trusting his judgment when they found that his advice often conflicted with the student's own immediate goals. In their relations with faculty, no student groups functioned in an adequate mediating capacity. Nor was there a body of norms, traditional among the students, that provided patterns of conduct for effective interaction with professors. In general, only when students reached the upper-division years did they form close working relations with their classmates and teachers. Repeated association in smaller sized classes helped bring this about. Even so, some students never formed personal associations within the academic sphere.

Students prepared for their classroom performance by studying. The quality of the performance was measured by the grading system and, as a consequence, the satisfaction the student derived from his studying lay more in the grade he made, than in the intrinsic worth of the content. Since grades were made primarily by getting high scores on examinations and written papers, students often neglected regular study of their subjects, in favor of last minute cramming. Thus they could briefly retain enough facts long enough to make a good score.

Grades, in their quantified form of the grade-point average, were made enormously important to students by their administrative use. In addition to epitomizing a student's academic standing, minimum g.p.a.s were specified by university agencies for participation and eligibility for all manner of activities and awards. The grading system, in all its ramifications, admirably suited the organizational needs of the Greek system by providing an instrument for making refined discriminations for membership qualification and relative status ranking. Its presumed precision was of course, largely mythical, for no instrument based on a five-point ordinal scale can produce numbers of two or three significant digits.

Since grades were based primarily on examinations and papers, the system lent itself to manipulation by various devices more or less legitimate. The residents of organized houses gained an advantage over other students by their use of member discipline, mutual aid, and the maintenance of files of past examinations, laboratory reports, and papers. Of course, these means and others were used by independent students--even by residents of scholar residences--as well as by Greeks, when they were available. The provision of semilegitimate means for making grades, as alternatives to legitimate scholarship, was the clearest instance of student subculture within the academic sphere at S. U. But rather than solving problems of studying, these subcultural means, provided alternatives that were contrary to the norms of the institution, and, in the case of dishonest methods, in conflict with the values of the majority of students. This part of the subculture created more problems than it solved.

Participants in the Selected Student Plan of the honors program of the School of Letters and Sciences were placed in more favorable social situations for learning than regular students. They were assigned special advisors who took a personal interest in their welfare. They enrolled in more of the small honors sections, than other students, where they had an opportunity to become acquainted with one another and with their professors. Because they saw one another in more than one class and met on other occasions, selectees had more opportunity to form meaningful social ties within the academic sphere than was true of other students. However, their interaction did not develop to the point of forming a cohesive group that could serve a mediating function with the university as an institution.

Those few honor students who won research awards were often drawn into personal relations with faculty members through their participation in mature scholarly and scientific work. They were no longer merely playing at scholarship, but participating in actual research projects. Through close association, they often identified with their mentors, and were thus able to imaginatively project themselves into the role of scholar or scientist. These became realistic career choices for the student apprentices.

Students in the honors program were promptly drawn into close personal association with classmates and faculty, that many other students didn't experience until they began work on their specialties in the junior and senior years. The classroom was more like a group, than a mass of individuals, and association in the academic enterprise was pleasurable in itself. Enjoyment of class participation motivated efficient and systematic studying. The close ties with instructors facilitated a transfer of scholarly values as well as knowledge. Scholarship became more of an end in itself instead of being merely a form of work used as a means toward qualifying for a degree or preparing for a profession.

This comparison between the roles of honor and regular students points up characteristics of the social situation that affect the educational process. The level of academic achievement is maximized by close personal association of students with one another and with the faculty. The emergence of stable enduring groups within the academic sphere reinforces the learning process by linking it with gratifying interpersonal relationships. When professors are personally involved with their students in the learning process, there is a transfer of orientation along with knowledge. They become more than teachers; they become role models of scholars and scientists who are emulated by many of their students.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE FOR FIRST INTERVIEW, OCTOBER, 1959

I. High school
  A. Academic aspect
  B. Activities
  C. Friends
II. College
  A. Expectations of college
    1. What were they?
    2. How obtained?
  B. Choice of college
  C. Goals in college
  D. Problems
    1. Living accommodations
    2. Academic
    3. Social (dating)
    4. Activities
    5. Home ties

OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS FOR SECOND INTERVIEW, JANUARY, 1960

I. Background information
  A. Home town size
  B. High school size
  C. Parents occupation
  D. Parents education
  E. Motivation for college attendance; S. U. in particular
  F. Description of community
  G. Description of home life
II. Christmas vacation
  A. With whom was Christmas vacation spent?
  B. How did you feel about going home?
  C. What did you do?
  D. Did you feel any different at home? (changes in self-identification)
  E. What was your relationship with your family? (Variables to be taken into account: Did your parents go to college? Are there differences of opinion regarding college per se, or regarding the particular course of study? How much do parents desire a college education for their children?)
  F. What was your relationship with friends?
  G. Has college so far made a change in you as revealed by a new look at old friends and familiar places at home?
  H. Did you feel very much like a college student while you were home?
III. Final exam week
  A. How did the final week impress you? Was it difficult? Would you like to see any changes? If so, what?
  B. What pressures did you feel?
  C. How did your friends react to final week? Study hard? Goof off?
  D. What did you do after your last exam?
IV. Reflections on first semester
  A. Academic
    1. How were your grades?
    2. Do you feel your instructors are interested in you?
    3. What have you learned your first semester that you believe will make your second semester easier academically?

    4. Have you decided on a major?
    5. Do you feel you have improved intellectually since you have been in school?
    6. What particular courses did you like last semester? Why?
    7. Do you feel any teacher was influential on your attitudes toward college?
    8. What instructors did you like least and why?
    9. What courses are you taking this semester?

B. Social
    1. How would you describe your friends? Where do you meet them?
    2. What do you have in common with your friends? Residence? Activities? Classes? Scholastic ability or achievement? Other interests?
    3. How do you get along with others? Explain.
    4. What groups would you like to belong to?
    5. What groups would you want to avoid?
    6. Do you feel you have improved socially since you have been here?
    7. How loyal do you feel to S. U.?
    8. To what extent do you feel you are a college student?
    9. How do you feel about dating?
    10. What do you do on a date? Does it vary with the person? How? Why?

C. Activities
    1. Do you think you may be more active now that you are familiar with college life?
    2. How do you feel about activities?
    3. Do you feel you can rank campus organizations?
    4. Who seems to be a big man on campus? What kind of characteristics does it take?
    5. (Girls) What about rushing? When did you decide? What factors had to be considered (scholarship, finances)?

D. Living-group
    Do you feel closely associated with your living-group now?

E. General
    1. Do you feel you personally have changed during the first semester?
    2. What people have helped you and in what ways?
    3. Have your ties with home changed any?
    4. Do you feel you are tamer or wilder than you were in high school? How?
    5. How would you describe college to your best friend who is, say, thinking about coming to college?
    6. What are your general impressions regarding one semester of college?
    7. Do you enjoy college? Why? Why not?
    8. What do you dislike about college?
    9. How have you managed financially?
    10. How do you feel about the S. U. advisory system?

F. Religion
    1. How does your church-going compare to when you are home?
    2. Are you active in campus religious activity?
    3. Has your college experience affected your religious beliefs?

OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS FOR THIRD INTERVIEW, OCTOBER, 1960

I. Background
    A. How have your relationships with your family changed since you entered college?
    B. What influence do your parent's have on your college career (help or hinder)?
    C. Do you plan to go home as much this year as you did last?
    D. Do you participate in any community activities here in town?
    E. High school friends
        1. What are they doing now?
        2. What is your contact with them now?

II. Summer vacation
  A. Where did you spend your summer and what did you do? (Probe as to implications for college career.)
  B. Did you keep in touch with any S. U. students during the summer?
  C. Who did you associate with mostly, family, high school friends, college friends?
  D. Did you do any reflective thinking on your college career?
  E. Has college so far made a change in you as revealed by a new look at old friends and familiar places at home?
  F. Did you feel very much like a college student this summer?

III. Academic
  A. Spring semester
    1. How were your grades last semester (final exams)?
    2. How did you feel about what you learned?
    3. What courses did you like last semester? Why?
    4. How have your teachers influenced your attitudes towards college?
    5. What instructors did you like least and why?
  B. Present semester
    1. How did you arrive at a class schedule?
    2. Did you get the classes you wanted?
    3. Who was most help to you in planning your schedule?
    4. Have you decided upon a major yet, or, how do you feel about your major?
    5. How much time do you spend studying? Is this adequate?
    6. How have your study methods changed since last year?
    7. Has your attitude toward study or scholarship changed since last year? If so, how? Why?

IV. Social
  A. Spring semester
    1. What are your friends like? Where did you meet them?
    2. How did you get along with others? Explain.
    3. What groups did you run around with last semester?
    4. What groups did you avoid?
    5. Did you date (how often)?
  B. Present semester
    1. Do you still see last semester's friends? Have you made any new friends?
    2. What do you do together? (If necessary, probe to see if they might study together, etc.)
    3. What do you have in common with your friends?
    4. How do you get along with others? Explain.
    5. What groups would you like to belong to, or not like to belong to?
    6. Do you feel that you have improved socially since you have been to college?
    7. How do you feel about dating?
    8. Where do you go on a date?
    9. What do you look for in the person you date?

V. Activities
  A. Spring semester
    1. What activities were you in during second semester last year?
    2. How do you feel about those activities?
  B. Present semester
    1. What activities do you belong to this semester?
    2. How do you feel about these activities?
    3. Do you hold any positions of responsibility in the organizations to which you belong?
    4. How much time do you devote to clubs and acrivities? Do you feel you are doing enough or too much? Why?

5. Are you working part time?
6. What do you do for recreation?

VI. Living-group
- A. Are you living the same place this year that you did last year?
- B. If not, how do the two places compare? Which do you like the best? Why did you change? Are you satisfied with where you live now?

- C. Do you feel closely associated with your living-group now?
- D. How well do you get along with your roommates?
- E. Do you feel that your status in your residence has changed this year? How?

VII. Attitudes toward campus life
- A. How has your idea of the typical college student changed since you came to S. U.?
- B. How do you feel you are different in behavior, thoughts, and feelings as a result of your year as a college student?
- C. From what you have seen, living at S. U. over a year, how would you describe the way students act?
- D. How do you feel about S. U. as a university now that you have been here for a year?
- E. Do you find yourself using student slang words such as for buildings, places, hang outs, and types? If so, what are they? In what groups are they used?
- F. In what ways have you felt social pressures at S. U.?
- G. What "cultural" events have you attended at S. U.?
- H. How do you feel about the morals of S. U. students?
- I. Have your preconceptions of campus life changed since you came to college?
- J. Do you enjoy college? Why? Why not?

VIII. Goals and beliefs
- A. Do you feel that your first year was a successful one (Probe)?
- B. What do you feel were your most satisfying experiences during your first year at S. U.?
- C. Have you set any new goals for yourself or altered any old goals since coming to S. U.?
- D. Has your college experience affected your beliefs? Your religion?

OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS FOR FOURTH INTERVIEW, FEBRUARY, 1961

I. Off campus ties and relationships
- A. What feelings do your parents express about your academic life? social life?
- B. How do your parents help or hinder your college career?
- C. How frequently do you write, phone or go home?
- D. Where do you spend your vacations? Why?
- E. What changes have occured in your family situation since you have been at S. U.? How has this affected you?
- F. What are your present feelings about high school friends and your hometown? (Ask only when ties have been previously mentioned.)
- G. What contacts do you maintain with off campus friends?
- H. How do you feel about S. U. when you talk to friends from other colleges? (feelings of pride, degree of difficulty, etc.)
- I. How good or bad was your high school preparation for college?

II. Vacations (Christmas, Semester, Spring)
- A. Where did you go and what did you do?
- B. Did you enjoy yourself?
- C. Were you anxious to return to school?
- D. Did you see any old friends?
- E. Were you ever referred to as a college student?

III. Final week
  A. How well did you do in finals?
  B. How did you study for finals? Was this any different from the way you previously studied?
  C. Describe the way you think your friends felt about final week.

IV. Academic
  A. Fall semester
    1. Courses and grades
      a. What were your grades last semester?
      b. How do these grades compare with last year's grades?
      c. Were you satisfied with your grades? If not, what would you like to have received? If so, is this higher than you had expected?
      d. Were you satisfied with what you learned? (Probe to get at practical vs. cultural values.)
      e. What courses did you like best and why?
      f. Did you have any courses in a new field which appealed to you?
    2. Teachers and advisors
      a. How did you feel about your instructors?
      b. Did you have any instructors you particularly liked or disliked? Why?
      c. Did you feel that your teachers were interested in you personally?
      d. Do you ever see any of your professors outside of class?
      e. How do you feel about your advisor?
    3. Curriculum
      a. How do you feel you have adjusted to the academic requirements?
      b. What changes would you like to see made in relation to academic requirements? (Probe specifically about Western Culture.)
      c. Many people say courses are getting harder. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?
      d. How do you feel about your major? Have you changed or do you contemplate a change?
  B. Spring semester
    1. How did you select your courses for this semester? (Anyone help?)
    2. What electives are you taking? Why?
    3. How well do you like your courses this semester?
    4. Have you ever dropped a course you were enrolled in? Why?

V. Social (fall and spring semester)
  A. Friends
    1. Have you made any new friends since we last talked to you?
    2. How do you select your friends?
    3. What do you do together?
    4. Have any of your friends left school?
    5. Are you satisfied with your friends?
    6. Do you spend as much time with your friends as you would like?
  B. Dating
    1. How frequently do you date? Is this more or less than you would like to? (For non-daters, ask them if they have started dating.)
    2. What do you think of S. U. dating practices?
    3. What do you do on a date? How has your concept of dating changed since high school?
  C. Other
    1. How much does your family know about your social life at school?
    2. Do you purposely arrange to have some spare time? To do what?
    3. Do you have any outside work during the school term?

VI. Activities
  A. Have you joined any new activities or organizations this semester?
  B. Do you feel that these activities are worthwhile? Why?

C. Which activities do you feel are the most helpful? Most enjoyable?
D. Do you feel that activities help or hinder your studies?
E. Would you like to be in any more activities? If so, which ones?

VII. Living-group
A. Did you change living-groups this semester? If so, why?
B. How satisfied are you with your present group? How does this differ from last semester? last year?
C. How active are you in it?
D. What kind of friendships have you developed in your living-group?
E. What changes, if any, have you noticed in your opinion of S. U. living-groups?

VIII. Attitudes toward campus life
A. Describe how you feel about college life?
B. Do you feel that other S. U. students share similar attitudes toward college life?
C. What do you like or dislike about your life at S. U.?
D. Has college life posed any particular problems for you?
E. Do you feel a part of S. U.?
F. What do you feel is the common attitude among S. U. students toward classes, grades, cheating, etc.?
G. What standards and moral codes do you have? Is this what you think most students have?

IX. Goals and beliefs
How do you feel about your first two years at S. U.? Are you satisfied with them?

OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS FOR FIFTH INTERVIEW, OCTOBER, 1962

I. General objective and procedure: Ask about experiences since the last interview up to the present. The major divisions of the interview are the topics or areas of experience rather than the time periods. Under each topic begin with the present since it is fresh in his mind, and work backwards.

II. Academic
A. Courses and grades: For each semester and summer session, find out what he studied, what he got out of it, and the quality of instruction.
  1. Fall, 1962
    a. How do you feel about your classes this year?
    b. Are there any you are particularly excited about?
  2. Each previous semester or summer session
    a. How did things go in the spring semester last year (fall semester)?
    b. How did you feel about the grades you got?
    c. What did you think of the content of the courses you took?
    d. What about your instructors?
B. Major subject or subjects: What are they? When, why, how, and under whose influence were they chosen? Satisfaction and changes? How hard or easy they are and the extent to which this was a consideration in choosing a major?
  1. What is your major?
  2. When did you decide on your major?
  3. How did you come to choose this major? (Probe for the influence of other people and its relation to his plans after graduation.)
  4. Did you consider any other subject for a major? What?
  5. Is there any one close to you who thinks you should have picked a different major? (Friends, family, relatives)
  6. How well do you know the instructors in your major department?
  7. Has your major advisor been helpful in planning your program? (Is his opinion based on all semesters since declaring a major?)

        8. How have you chosen your electives?
        9. (If advisor is mentioned) Could you have done as well without him?
        10. Who else helped you plan your programs? (Probe for influence of other students.)
    C. Minor field: Since the minor is not so important as the major we don't need to ask so many questions.
        1. What is your minor?
        2. Why did you choose it?
        3. How did you decide what courses to take in the minor?

III. Social
    A. Friends
        1. Did you make new friends during the past year?
        2. What are they like?
        3. How are they different from your older friends?
        4. What do you have in common with your friends?
        5. What do you do together?
        6. Do you ever help each other with your school work?
        7. What do you talk about with your friends?
    B. Dating (Ask of single students, but remember that one in five students don't date.)
        1. Tell me about your social life. (or, How much did you date?)
        2. What about dating last year?
        3. Was it more or less than you liked?
        4. What did you do on dates?
        5. What personal qualities do you like in a date? (Probe: "Any other characteristics or qualities?")
        6. Did you date more than one person?
        7. Where does marriage fit into your future plans?
    C. Engagement and marriage (Ask only of engaged or married students.)
        1. How do you spend your time now that you are engaged (or married)?
        2. Some students say their grades go up after they are engaged (or married). Did this happen to you?

IV. Living-group
    A. Where did you live last year?
    B. Where do you live now?
    C. (If there has been a change) Why did you change?
    D. How did you feel about it as a group, and a place to live? (Probe for effect on academic and social life.)
    E. (For those in organized houses or dormitories) Have you held any offices of done anything for your living-group?
    F. Do you think you would have done any better in school if you had lived somewhere else? Why?

V. Activities
    A. What organizations were you in last year, if any? (Any other activities?)
    B. What about this semester?
    C. Have you joined any having to do with your major field?
    D. Have you held any offices or been on any committees?
    E. How do you feel about spending your time on these things? (Probe for advantages and disadvantages.)
    F. Why do you participate in these activities?

VI. Attitudes toward college
    A. What were your feelings about coming back to school this fall?
    B. How was it a year ago?
    C. Did you ever think about leaving S. U.? Why?
    D. Which of your first three years was the hardest for you? Why? (Probe for scholastic difficulties and what he did about it.)
    E. What have you gotten out of college so far? (Probe for intellectual development.)

F. Have you had any financial problems?
G. How did you solve them?
H. Did they affect your grades?
I. Have you received any honors or awards at S. U.? (Ask for all years.)

VII. Family and vacations
A. How do your folks feel about your college experience?
B. Do you spend your vacations at home?
C. What is your relationship with your family? (Probe for last year.)
D. Are there any subjects you avoid in conversations with them? What?
E. Did you work this summer? And the summer before last?
F. Did your work have anything to do with your future career?
G. (If yes) Did it have any affect on your thinking about your career?
H. Did you notice any changes in people's attitudes toward you when you are at home? How are they different?

OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS FOR SIXTH INTERVIEW, MARCH, 1963

I. General objectives: Our primary objectives in this final interview are to get (1) overall reactions to the college experience, and (2) future expectations that are influenced by his having attended college. To orient your informant to our objective you can initiate the interview by saying: "Since this will probably be our last interview with you, we want to get your overall reactions to your experiences at S. U. over the past four years, and also what you think the future will be like for you; but before we go into that, and just to get the record up to date. . ."

II. Major and minor programs
A. Have you changed your major or minor since last semester? (If yes, ask why.)
B. Have you added another major? Why?
C. Have your studies at S. U. given you what you think you will need after graduation?
D. Are they providing preparation for a career?

III. Classes and grades
A. Of all the classes you've had, which ones would you say were the best? Why?
B. Which ones were the worst? Why?
C. Now, thinking back over the different kinds of classes you have had at S. U. how would you compare the big lecture classes with small classes? Which kind did you get most out of?
D. Have you ever been in classes where students protested to the instructor that he required an excessive amount of work, or allowed too little time for an assignment? What happened? (Probe for what students said, and the instructor's response.)
   1. (If "yes" to D) Did you express your opinion to the instructor? (Probe: Inside or outside of class?)
   2. Did you express your opinion to the other students?
E. Have you been in classes where students agreed among themselves to limit the amount of work they would do?
   1. (If "yes" to E) What did they agree about?
   2. How was agreement reached? Tell me about it.
   3. Did you abide by the agreement?
F. When you compare the courses you have had recently with those you had when you were a freshman or a sophomore, would you say, in general, they are getting harder or easier for you? Why? (Probe for changes in student, professors, and content.)
G. Have the grades you have received reflected what you got out of your studies?
H. Are grades important for your future? How? (Probe for effect on employment or further education.)

- I. Were you ever under pressure to make grades? When and why? (Probe for pressure from living group, parents, formal requirements and regulations--probation, honor role, scholarship, major requirements, and self.)
  1. (If "yes" to I) What did you do about the pressure?
  2. Did it affect your choice of courses? Which ones?
  3. Did you get help? From whom? (Tutors, friends, instructors, etc.)
  4. Did you use house files? What did you use? Was it helpful?
  5. Have you ever been in a class where you thought cheating was justified? Have you ever done it yourself? Would you help a friend?
- J. How do you feel about the publicity given to grade-point averages for campus groups and categories of students?

IV. Honors program

- A. Have you held a scholarship or lived in a scholar residence? (Ask for details.)
- B. Did you ever take an honors section of a regular course? Which ones? (If "yes".)
  1. How would you compare the honors sections you have had with regular sections?
  2. Did you get more out of them?
  3. Was the work harder or easier?
  4. Was it harder or easier to get a high grade?
- C. Have you ever taken an advanced class without having the prerequisites or required class standing?
  (If "yes")
  1. What course (or courses) did you take?
  2. How did it (they) turn out?
- D. Are you taking a departmental honors course for seniors?
  (If "yes")
  1. What do you do in the course?
  2. What do you think of it?
- E. Have you ever held an undergraduate research assistantship?
  (If "yes")
  1. What did you do?
  2. What did you get out of it?
- F. Since September, have you received any awards, or been elected to any honorary societies? How did you feel about it?
- G. (If "yes" to C, D, E, or F) Has your honors work affected your:
  1. Academic program
  2. Goals and aspirations
  3. Your relations with your professors
  4. Family and friends
  5. Ideas of yourself and your ability
- H. (If "yes" to any of the above questions A-F) Have you ever thought of yourself as an honors student?
  (If "yes")
  1. When did you first think of yourself in this way?
  2. What were the circumstances?

V. Further education

- A. When will you graduate?
- B. Do you plan any additional education after you graduate? Why? What kind?
- C. (If "yes" to B and he will graduate in June or complete requirements during the summer, ask): Have you applied for, or received, a scholarship, fellowship, grant, or assistantship for graduate study?
- D. (If he will not graduate in June or finish graduation requirements during the summer of 1963, ask): Why aren't you graduating in June?

- VI. Future employment
  - A. Are you planning to work soon after graduation?
  - B. What will you be doing?
  - C. How did you get (or, how are you going about getting) a position?
- VII. Military service (for boys)
  - A. What about your service obligations in the armed forces? (Probe for postponement or evasion of the draft.)
  - B. Do you plan to get a commission? How? (ROTC, 6 months as an enlistee, other ways)
- VIII. Dating and marriage plans (Note, check marital status in Student Directory)
  - A. (Ask only of those not known to be married) Are you dating anyone regularly, or are you engaged?
  - B. Have you made any marriage plans?
  - C. (If he has plans) How do you feel about having marriage plans? or (if he has no plans) Does it bother you that you don't have marriage plans?
  - D. (Ask of the unmarried) What do you consider to be the best age for you to marry? Why?
  - E. (If married or has marriage plans) What career plans does your (future) husband (or wife) have?
  - F. (Ask only of those engaged or married within the last year) Some students say their grades go up after they are engaged (or married). Did this happen to you?
- IX. The future

  Imagine that everything works out the way you would like. In ten years from now--
  - A. What do you think you will be doing? (work, recreation, community service) (Note: If resistant to this line of questioning, go on to question IX-D.)
  - B. In what kind of place will you be living? (Probe for part of the country, kind of community or neighborhood.)
  - C. What will your status be there? (Socio-economic status, organizational rank, leadership) or Have you imagined what your position would be?
  - D. When you're an alum, will you make regular contributions to S. U.? Why?
- X. Looking back on college
  - A. Now, thinking back over the last four years, if you knew what you know now, would you have enrolled at S. U. in the fall of 1959? Why do you say that?
  - B. What was most valuable to you during these years at S. U.? (Probe for knowledge, training for occupation, personal development, values, attitudes, friendships, mate.)
  - C. What was the worst thing about your S. U. experience?
  - D. What would you do differently, if you had to do it over again? (Probe for choice of major, liberal vs. practical training, join a fraternity, activities.)
  - E. What advice would you give a prospective S. U. freshman?
  - F. When did you really begin to feel like a college student? What happened?
  - G. A big campus like ours has many different kinds of students.
    1. As you see it, what are the various categories of students at S. U.? (If answers are not complete or full enough): What other kinds of students are there?
    2. How would you characterize each of these different categories of students?
    3. (If he does not use customary terms, ask): What words are commonly used by S. U. students to refer to these different categories of students?
    4. How do you rank these different kinds of students by their standing on the campus?
    5. Is there general agreement among students on the ranking? (If he asks, What students?", say: the students you know.)
    6. To which kind do you feel you belong?
    7. Which kind is most appealing to you? Least?

  H. What do you consider to have been your most worthwhile campus activities?
  I. In general, what campus activities do you think are most worthwhile?
XI. Close: Well, that does it! Is there anything you would like to add to what you already said about your experiences at S. U.? Thanks for all your help in our research.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR WRITING A REPORT ON YOUR COLLEGE CAREER

I. General instructions
  A. Present your report in historical time sequence arranged by semesters or years.
  B. Report events during summer vacations that affected your college career.
  C. Write in the first person.
  D. You may disguise the identification of persons, organizations and places. If you use disguised names, it will be helpful, but not necessary for you to add a page giving a key to correct identifications.
  E. Be sure to describe important events in concrete detail. Significant conversations should be reconstructed as nearly word-for-word as possible.
II. Background information
  A. Identify your home town, and if it is small, briefly describe it.
  B. Characterize the neighborhood in which you grew up.
  C. Describe your high school experiences including such things as your academic interests and standing, activities, sports and popularity.
  D. Describe your family, all of its members, and your relationships with each of them.
  E. What is your family's socio-economic status?
  F. Describe your father's occupation.
III. Attitudes toward college before you enrolled
  A. What were your ideas and expectations of college before you enrolled as a freshman?
  B. How did you get your ideas of college? From persons, books, movies, speakers, etc.
  C. What persons influenced your thinking about a choice of college? Your parents, relatives, friends, teachers, coaches, etc.
  D. Have your high school friends gone to college? What are they doing now?
IV. Persons and groups who have affected you. During each semester, explain your relations with persons and groups and their influence on your thinking, feelings, and actions.
  A. Those with whom you have lived
  B. Teachers and classmates
  C. Campus organizations and activities
  D. Friends of both sexes
  E. Friends of the opposite sex
V. Off campus influences on your college career
  A. How has your family helped or hindered your college career?
  B. How have you been influenced by ties off the campus with friends, through dating, in organizations, and through employment?
VI. Academic aspects of your college career
  A. How well have you done in course work?
    1. What problems have you encountered in studying?
    2. What have you done to solve them?
    3. How have you been helped by others?
  B. How have you felt about your grades?
  C. How have you felt about your major?
  D. Have you been satisfied with what you have learned?
  E. What courses have you liked best, what courses did you like least and why?
  F. What did you think of your professors?

VII. Important events in your college career: Describe significant things, both gratifying and disappointing, that happened to you and their effect on you such as:
    A. Joining or not joining a fraternity
    B. Getting, or failing to get some achievement
    C. Become active in a group, an organization, or activity
    D. Running for an office
    E. Athletic achievements
    F. Choosing or changing your major
    G. Getting pinned or depinned, lavaliered, engaged, etc.

VIII. Goals and adjustments in college
    A. Did you have any specific reasons for coming to college?
        1. What objectives did you set for yourself, if any?
        2. How have they changed?
        3. How do you feel about the progress you have made toward your goals?
    B. Describe your conception of yourself when you entered college and the changes that have occurred.
        1. What, if any, ideals of conduct or belief have you held?
        2. How have you measured up to these ideals?
        3. What new or changed ways of behaving or thinking have you learned or tried out?
    C. What things in life have been most important to you? How have these changed?
    D. What, if any, plans do you have for the future and how have they changed?

IX. What other things have been important in your college experience?

APPENDIX B

CODING INSTRUCTIONS, RELIABILITY, AND DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

This appendix contains an abridgement of coding instructions that were actually used. Reliability information is given for variables twenty to fifty-four, which were based primarily on content analysis of interviews. Following the titles of each of these variables are three items of information at each level of reliability for which coded responses to that variable were used: (1) the number of cases, (2) the percent of intercoder agreement, and (3) Scott's pi, an index of intercoder agreement which corrects for the number of categories in the code, and the frequency with which each is used.*

The percentage distribution of characteristics or responses is given in the right-hand margin. The percents are based on the number of persons who were questioned on that topic, and from whom classifiable responses were obtained.

1. Military service

0.	No service	83.3
1.	Veteran only (or has completed 6 months or more active duty)	0
2.	ROTC only	16.7
3.	Veteran and ROTC	0
4.	No information	0
		N=116

2. Residence of parents, Fall, 1959

0.	In-state	73.9
1.	Metropolis and its suburbs and satellites	7.4
2.	Other out-of-state	18.7
		N=116

3. Religious preference

0.	None and other	7.2
1.	Denominational Protestant	69.4
2.	Intermediate Protestant	10.7
3.	Sectarian Protestant	3.9
4.	Roman Catholic	8.8
		N=116

4. Major subject preference, Fall, 1959

0.	Undeclared	13.5
--	Social science	0
1.	Natural science	5.9
2.	Humanities	8.3
3.	Pre-professional	32.9
4.	Professional	39.4
		N=107

5. Education of father

Use admission application. (Exclude non-collegiate business and correspondence school courses and degrees, etc.)

1.	Eighth grade or less	6.8
2.	Some high school	4.1
3.	High school graduate	37.6
4.	Some college (include persons for whom graduation or a degree is not indicated and junior college graduates)	22.6

---

*William A. Scott, op. cit., p. 323.

5.	College graduate	13.0
6.	Some graduate work	1.0
7.	Graduate degree (M. A., Ph. D., M. D., etc.)	14.9
		N=111

6. Education of mother

1.	Eighth grade or less	3.6
2.	Some high school	10.4
3.	High school graduate	39.8
4.	Some college (include person for whom graduation or a degree is not indicated and junior college graduates)	29.4
5.	College graduate	14.1
6.	Some graduate work	0
7.	Graduate degree (M. S., Ph. D., M. D., etc.)	2.6
		N=113

7. Major, or professional objective, Spring, 1963, or last known

Use S. U. registration code. Base coding on the final interview and/or academic record. Code a professional objective rather than an undergraduate major. When the student has two or more majors, code the major most important to him (usually the earliest chosen and the one in which he has taken the most courses).

0.	Undeclared	9.7
1.	Social science	4.1
2.	Natural science	5.9
3.	Humanities	9.8
4.	Pre-professional	17.1
5.	Professional	53.4
		N=112

8. Rank in high school

0.	For the 1st (lowest) decile, 0-9th percentile	1.0
1.	For the 2nd decile, 10-19th percentile	1.0
2.	For the 3rd decile, 20-29th percentile	3.9
3.	For the 4th decile, 30-39th percentile	4.9
4.	For the 5th decile, 40-49th percentile	5.9
5.	For the 6th decile, 50-59th percentile	9.8
6.	For the 7th decile, 60-69th percentile	12.1
7.	For the 8th decile, 70-79th percentile	13.8
8.	For the 9th decile, 80-89th percentile	18.9
9.	For the 10th (highest) decile, 90-99th percentile	28.7
		N=116

9. ACE psychological examination

Use total score on placement exam. Code 100s and 10s digits.

2-10	Approximate 1st (lowest) quartile of sample	25.8
11	Approximate 2nd quartile	16.8
12,13	Approximate 3rd quartile	23.8
14-17	Approximate 4th (highest) quartile	33.6
		N=110

10. Change of school

Base coding on academic record, interviews, and admission application.

0.	No change	60.0
1.	Change required by rule	13.3
2.	Change from undecided	3.8
3.	Changed twice (one required by rule)	4.9
4.	Changed once	13.1
5.	Changed two or more times	4.9
		N=116

11. Number of semesters enrolled at S. U. at the time of last interview.
Count semesters on academic record whether completed or not. Exclude summer sessions and enrollment at any other collegiate-level institution. Code actual number. If there are no interviews, code 0.

0.	5.2
1.	9.1
2.	18.5
3.	4.9
4.	14.6
5.	1.3
6.	2.0
7.	4.9
8.	39.5
	N=116

12. Credit hours of college work
Code 100s and 10s digits. This code represents the amount of course-work undertaken, whether satisfactorally completed or not through Spring, 1963.

0, 1, 2, 3.	Through 34 hours	23.8
4, 5, 6.	35-64 hours	12.1
7, 8, 9, 10, 11.	65-115 hours	13.8
12, 13, 14, 15.	116-150 hours	50.3
		N=116

13. Grade-point average
Latest cumulative g.p.a. Round off to one decimal place. Exclude grades earned at other colleges.

0 - .9.	Failing	14.0
1.0-1.9.	D	22.1
2.0-2.5.	C- and C	30.7
2.6-2.9.	C+ and B-	14.1
3.0-4.0.	B and A	19.1
		N=114

14. Trend of grade-point averages
This code is based upon g.p.a.s by semesters. Code according to overall trend. Exclude summer term grades.

0.	Enrolled only one semester or not at all	10.1
1.	Constant: maintains same g.p.a. through all semesters of enrollment, only slight variation from semester to semester within a range of 1.0 (i.e., + or - .5) although one of eight semesters may exceed this limit.	32.2
2.	Rising: g.p.a. increases each semester, or at least never declines significantly (or more than .5 in any one semester).	19.9
3.	Declining (converse of 2)	10.7
4.	Erratic: g.p.a. increases or decreases every semester or two by .6 or more.	27.1
		N=116

15. Semester in which student was last interviewed

0.	Not interviewed	1.3
1.	Fall, 1959	12.1
2.	Spring, 1960	19.5
3.	Fall, 1960	2.9
4.	Spring, 1961	12.7
5.	Fall, 1961	0
6.	Spring, 1962	0
7.	Fall, 1962	3.9
8.	Spring, 1963	47.6
		N=116

16. Honor student, Spring, 1963

0.	Not an honor student	88.3
1.	Departmental honors as noted in commencement program (if not coded 2 or 3)	1.0
2.	Grade-point average 3.2 or more (if not coded 3)	7.6
3.	Graduated cum laude (as noted in commencement program)	3.1
		N=116

17. Honor student, Fall, 1959
(weighted percent)

0.	Not an honor student	94.3
1.	On dean's list of freshmen honor students	5.7
		N=116

18. Graduation
Code on the basis of the last declared major (Variable 7) and the student's classification in Spring, 1963, according to his academic record.

1.	Graduated in Spring, 1963, or earlier	27.8
2.	Enrolled in a five-year curriculum, and completed the fourth year course of study in Spring, 1963.	4.2
3.	Enrolled in a four-year curriculum, but did not graduate in Spring, 1963.	63.1
4.	Enrolled in a five-year curriculum, but did not complete the fourth year course of study in Spring, 1963.	4.9
		N=116

19. Size of high school
Enrollment in 9th-12th grades, reported in State Educational Directory, 1958-59.

0.	Under 100	4.2
1.	100-199	16.9
2.	200-299	8.1
3.	300-399	5.9
4.	400-499	5.2
5.	500-599	2.0
6.	600-999	10.7
7.	1000 +	45.1
9.	Unknown	2.0
		N=116

20. Prestige of father's occupation (Cases=116, 75%, pi=.66)
The following classification of occupations by prestige level was designed to be valid for communities of under 300,000 population from which most State University students came. It was less valid for persons from very large cities, ethnic minorities, and occupations of female household heads. For this reason Negro students (two in the sample) and those from families where there was no male head of the household were coded zero. Code unlisted occupations by a listed occupation of comparable prestige. The scheme is adapted from those of W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker and Kenneth Eells, Social Class in America: A Manual of Procedure for the Measurement of Social Status (New York: Harper 1960), pp. 140-141; Mapheus Smith, "An Empirical Scale of Prestige Status of Occupations," American Sociological Review 8 (April, 1943), pp. 185-192; and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Occupations and Social Status (New York: Free Press, 1961); with modifications based on interviews with and reports by S. U. students.

Prestige Level	Professional and Service	Business and Industry	Agriculture	Military
1	Doctor Lawyer Dentist Professor Engineer Judge Minister (seminary graduate) School superintendent High school principal Chemist, etc. with graduate training Architect Publisher of a daily paper	Proprietor of large local business Executive or manager of branch of large industrial or financial enterprise Certified public accountant	Gentleman farmer or rancher Large farm or ranch owner (non-resident)	General Colonel 22.6
2	Undertaker Librarian (graduate) Osteopath Minister (some training) Editor of Daily paper County agricultural agent City manager Publisher of weekly paper	Proprietor of medium sized local business Manager of large local business Assistant manager, office, or dept. manager of branch of large business Accountant Real estate and insurance agent Postmaster Building Contractor	Large farm or ranch owner and operator including owner or leasee of several farms or large acreage	Major Army Captain Lieutenant 21.1
3	Social worker School teacher Librarian (not gradate) Minister (no training) Optometrist Undertaker's assistant Registered nurse Newspaper reporter	Proprietor of small business Minor business official Bank clerk Cashier Bookkeeper Auto salesman Secretary to executive Skilled trade (plumber, carpenter, electrician, butcher, printer, painter, etc.)	Medium sized farm owner Farm manager Leasee or renter of large farm	Sergeant 46.2
4	Beauty Operator Barber Fireman Policeman Practical nurse Cook (restaurant) Bartender	Retail clerk Postal clerk Mail carrier Auto mechanic Machine operator Semi-skilled worker Truck driver	Small farm owner or renter (marginal) Farm worker (resident)	Corporal

Prestige Level	Professional and Service	Business and Industry	Agriculture	Military
4		Radio and TV repairman Milk route man Coal miner		9.0
5	Night watchman Taxi driver Service station attendant Waitress Janitor (public building)	Dime store clerk Telephone operator Unskilled worker Assistant to carpenter, etc.		Private 1.1
6	Scrub woman Newsboy	Heavy labor Odd job man Railroad section hand	Migrant farm laborer	0 N=104

21. Solidarity with Father (C=36, 91%, pi=.87; C=48, 71%, pi=.59; C=32, 62%, pi=.50) The concept and criteria used in variables 21-23 are from Luther T. Jansen, "Measuring Family Solidarity," American Sociological Review 17 (December, 1952), pp. 727-733.

1. Strong	39.9
2. Moderate	44.6
3. Weak	5.8
4. Estranged	2.1
5. Father not present	11.6
	N=100

22. Solidarity with Mother (C=36, 91%, pi=.87; C=48, 71%, pi=.57; C=32, 62%, pi=.44)

1. Strong	45.0
2. Moderate	44.1
3. Weak	7.0
4. Estranged	1.2
5. Mother not present	2.7
	N=98

23. Solidarity with siblings (C-36, 70%, pi=.62; C=61, 65%, pi=.55; C=16, 64%, pi=.54)

1. Strong with all or any one sibling	27.8
2. Moderate with all or at least one sibling	38.2
3. Weak with all siblings	15.9
4. Estranged from all siblings	2.8
5. No siblings present	15.3
	N=81

24. Student independence and harmony with his family concerning social life in college (C=113, 82%, pi=.74; C=3, 65%, pi=.48)

1. Independence-Harmony: The student believes and acts like his family, but is able to arrive at his beliefs and actions through independent thinking; his family's beliefs are not forced upon him.	59.8
2. Independence-Conflict: The student breaks identification with his family and is independent or identifies with others. He rejects his family's beliefs and values.	6.3
3. Dependence-Harmony: The student has accepted the beliefs, values, and actions of his family, without any independent thinking.	13.3

4. Dependence-Conflict: The student goes along with his family's decisions and beliefs, but does so reluctantly. He has formulated other ideas and beliefs, but does not act according to them because of dependence on the family.	1.1
5. Harmony: No evidence of independence-dependence.	19.5
	N=97

25. Student independence and harmony with his family concerning academic life in college (Use same instructions as variable 24) (C=116, 70%, pi=.57)

1. Independence-Harmony	46.8
2. Independence-Conflict	5.7
3. Dependence-Harmony	28.4
4. Dependence-Conflict	8.7
5. Harmony: No evidence of independence-dependence.	10.4
	N=106

26. Status among peers in high school (C=36, 82%, pi=.76; C=48, 80%, pi=.73; C=32, 70%, pi=.61)

1. Leader: big wheel, one of elite	26.8
2. Participant: wheel, one of gang, holds minor of just a few offices	43.2
3. Follower: in activities but has no position of responsibility, may belong to minor clique	26.2
4. Non-participant: not in activities or clique either by own choice or because he is not accepted	3.8
	N=94

27. Reaction to academic aspect of freshman year (C=113, 72%, pi=.59; C=3, 66%, pi=.50) The ease or difficulty of the academic program is evaluated by the level or "hardness" of the content, amount of work, or intensity of competition.

1. Easy	8.0
2. Hard	59.0
3. Mixed: some hard, others easy, so they averaged out	13.7
4. Neither hard nor easy: kept him busy, but it wasn't too hard for him to handle	19.3
	N=104

28. Reaction to the social aspect of the freshman year (C=36, 73%, pi=.40; C=48, 70%, pi=.34; C=32, 60%, pi=.12)
Code ease or difficulty of making friends, participation in informal group activities, and getting dates.

1. Found people friendly, easy to make friends, not snobbish	85.2
2. Found people unfriendly, hard to make friends, many are snobbish	6.5
3. Mixed: some are friendly, others are not; can't say anything in general	8.3
	N=100

29. Reaction to housing during freshman year (C=113, 68%, pi=.57; C=3, 58%, pi=.42)

1. Very satisfied	25.8
2. Satisfied	42.4
3. Some dissatisfaction	22.9
4. Strongly dissatisfied in all or important respects	8.9
	N=106

30. Reactions to student morality during the freshman year (C=113, 82%, pi=.76; C=3, 80%, pi=.73)
Code evaluation of conduct and attitudes concerning ethical standards, smoking, drinking, sex, religion, cheating, etc.

1. Found a low level of conduct and prevalence of moral laxity	30.5
2. Found students generally hold to a high level of moral standards	8.7

3. Mixed: some students have high, others low standards 12.4
4. Found moral standards to be about average or the same as everywhere else 48.4

N=70

31. Greek or independent (C=36, 100%, pi=.1.0; C=80, 97%, pi=.95)
   1. Independent 52.7
   2. Independent, but was Greek (depledged or deactivated, no longer a member) 12.8
   3. Greek, but was Independent (delayed pledging beyond first opportunity) 2.3
   4. Greek 32.2

N=113

32. Housing arrangements at time of last interview (C=113, 100%, pi=1.0; C=3, 96%, pi=.95)
   1. Greek house 29.2
   2. Scholar residence 4.0
   3. Dormitory 35.0
   4. Apartment 19.6
   5. Co-operative house 0
   6. Rooming house 3.7
   7. Living at home 8.5

N=112

33. Satisfaction with present living arrangements (C=113, 80%, pi=.71; C=3, 76%, pi=.65)
   1. Very satisfied 34.8
   2. Satisfied 50.3
   3. Some dissatisfaction 10.1
   4. Strongly dissatisfied in all or important respects 4.8

N=102

34. Friendships on campus (C=113, 80%, pi=.73; C=3, 57%, pi=.42)
   1. Many friends, many close friends: interested in people and goes out of his way to meet and make friends, close, personal relationships with his friends, and frequently takes time to be with and talk to them. 5.7
   2. Many friends, few close friends: outgoing and interested in people, but has close contact with and confides in only a few friends. 42.9
   3. Few friends, few close friends: doesn't go out of his way to make friends, but does establish close relationships with a few friends. 36.8
   4. Many friends, no close friends: outgoing and interested in people, but doesn't establish close relationships with anyone, because he doesn't want to become too attached to people, and/or people don't want to become good friends with him; may have some superficial acquaintances. 2.2
   5. Few friends, no close ones: shy or anti-social, makes few acquaintances and these are casual relationships either because of the student's choice or because no one wants him as a close friend. 12.4

N=107

35. Status among students (C=36, 80%, pi=.69; C=48, 72%, pi=.58; C=32, 72%, pi=.57)
   1. Big wheel: outstanding campus leader, holds important offices, member of honorary societies, highly ranked living-group, respected major or career choice. 1.2
   2. Wheel: leader of groups or organizations, holds

offices, friend of big wheel, good grades, middle ranked living group, moderately respected major or career choice. 14.9

3. Participant: some characteristics of a wheel, but not so many activities, belongs to less prestigeful organizations. 58.8
4. Loser: may have one low ranking activity, low ranked living-group and major or career choice. 11.3
5. Left-out: non-participant, may live at home or commute, no activities. 13.8

N=110

36. Conformity with expectations of the majority of students (C=36, 60%, pi=.45; C=48, 57%, pi=.41; C=32, 55%, pi=.38)

1. Tends to conform, but is largely unaware of it. 43.0
2. Strives for conformity and perceives or rationalizes his reasons. 13.0
3. Tends to be individualistic, but is largely unaware of it. 14.4
4. Strives for individuality and perceives or rationalizes his reasons. 29.6

N=107

37. Personal security (C=116, 50%, pi=.28)

1. Very secure, self-confident 8.6
2. Fairly or usually secure 46.8
3. Somewhat or sometimes insecure 35.0
4. Very insecure, little self-confidence 9.6

N=110

38. Alienation-attachment toward the University (C=113, 67%, pi=.50; C=3, 62%, pi=.44)

1. Strong alienation (and no attachment): Expresses hostility, specific criticism, emphasizes negative aspects; may join with others in rebellion against the system; feels his education was inadequate and college life, for the most part, unenjoyable. He may wish he had chosen a different college or not gone to any college. 6.3
2. Moderate alienation (and weak attachment): Less hostility and emotionalism than above, more rational criticism; may feel he could have done better at another college. 11.4
3. Moderate attachment (and weak alienation): Accepts and approves the prevailing norms, beliefs, and values; feels his education was adequate and college life enjoyable; feels, however, that he might have done as well at other good colleges; some evidence of integration, identification, and commitment; speaks favorably of the University. 56.4
4. Strong attachment (and no alienation): Expresses enthusiasm and pleasure; identification, commitment, and integration is at a maximum; very enthusiastic about college life and feels S. U. is a "great" institution; may feel that almost nowhere else could he have gotten as good an education; "gung-ho" for the University. 25.9

N=109

39. Alienation-attachment toward the Greek system (C=113, 75%, pi=.65; C=3, 72%, pi=.61) Instructions are similar to those for variable 38.

1. Strong alienation 3.5
2. Moderate alienation 37.8

3. Moderate attachment	41.3
4. Strong attachment	17.4
	N=98
40. Value of ideas (C=113, 67%, pi=.54; C=3, 60%, pi=.44)	
1. Deeply involved in ideas, excited by what he is learning, eager for knowledge, enjoys discussion and sharing of new information and insights, intrigued by new philosophies and unusual ideologies.	16.1
2. Enjoys learning new ideas, but is not enthusiastic about them.	33.1
3. Not interested in ideas, and prefers descriptive, factual material, wants only "true" ideas, simple formulas, and guaranteed methods, wants answers, not questions.	46.1
4. Disturbed by ideas, avoids anything controversial, paradoxical, or ambiguous, disdainful of impractical idealists, critical of radical professors and beatnik students.	4.7
	N=98
41. Value of scholarship (C=113, 65%, pi=.52; C=3, 64%, pi=.54)	
1. Strong scholarly orientation: Finds gratification, pleasure, and a sense of fulfillment in his studies, including research, discussion, writing, practice, and creative work. Not much concerned about grades.	20.4
2. Somewhat scholarly: Gets some pleasure from his school work or is occasionally enthusiastic about a little of it. Sometimes works for grades.	40.3
3. Unscholarly: slight interest in the content of his studies. Only occasionally has he found his school work absorbing. If he ever works hard it is for grades or some other extrinsic purpose.	25.6
4. Anti-scholar: Finds no intrinsic pleasure in his school work. He is motivated entirely by extrinsic considerations: grades, family pressure or expectations, desire for status, or vocational requirements. His education is seen as a means to something else having no value in and of itself.	13.7
	N=102
42. Level of academic effort (C=113, 72%, pi=.55; C=3, 71%, pi=.53)	
1. Puts forth much effort, spends long hours studying, tries very hard, a perfectionist.	20.9
2. Works moderately hard, effort may not be constantly sustained, that is, he may work hard at some subjects but neglect others, or he may work hard for a while and "take it easy" at other times.	61.6
3. Puts forth a little effort, works enough to get by.	13.7
4. Seldom prepares for classes, does few assignments; likely to be placed on probation or dropped after the first semester.	3.8
	N=99
43. Satisfaction with grades (C=113, 72%, pi=.61; C=3, 63%, pi=.48)	
1. Very satisfied: Grades reflect time and effort he spent on his studies, or they were higher than he deserved. He doesn't think he could have done any better.	8.7
2. Satisfied: Grades about reflect time and effort spent on his studies. He thinks he might have done a little better if he had worked harder, studied more efficiently, spent more time on assignments, etc.	35.9

3. Dissatisfied: Believes he should have gotten higher grades, either because he deserved better grades or because he could have worked harder, etc. 46.0
4. Very dissatisfied: Grades were much lower than he thought he deserved or was capable of earning. He is certain he would have gotten higher grades if he had tried harder. He may admit he didn't do his best work. 9.4
5. Indifferent: Feels grades are unimportant and therefore the question of satisfaction with grades is of no concern. 0

N=98

44. Perception of freshman-sophomore advisor as a person (C=36, 80%, pi=.72; C=61, 72%, pi=.62; C=19, 60%, pi=.56)

1. Friendly: He goes out of his way to be helpful; knows students by name; student feels his advisor is interested in him as a person, and wants to discuss problems with him. 42.4
2. Casual: He offers needed help, but is impersonal; student feels his advisor is friendly, but never discusses problems with him. 15.9
3. Indifferent: Student fails to seek help from advisor or feels his advisor shows no genuine interest in him or his problem, nor does advisor appear friendly. Advisor's relationship to his advisees is purely mechanical, e.g. signing enrollment cards. 34.8
4. Cold, brusque, abrupt, rude: Student feels he is imposing on advisor so he doesn't see him often. Advisor takes no interest in his advisee--doesn't recall his name or face. 6.9

N=67

45. Perception of freshman-sophomore advisor's knowledge of courses and requirements (C=116, 78%, pi=.69)

1. Helpful: Advisor helps student plan schedule and offers suggestions for courses he might like. 36.5
2. Convenient: Advisor signs schedule which student has independently set up, seems unable to be much help. 42.1
3. Harmful: Advisor talks student into taking courses he is not interested in, and/or doesn't need, gives student misinformation. 21.4

N=64

46. Decision on major (C=113, 82%, pi=.74; C=3, 80%, pi=.71)
The student's decision is coded according to his thinking about the problem not according to the official records.

1. Decided, and never considered changing his major. 40.7
2. Decided, but has thought about changing. 5.6
3. Decided now, but has changed from a previous choice of major. 38.2
4. Changed or has dropped a previous choice of major, but is still uncertain. 3.1
5. Has never decided on a major. 12.4

N=109

47. Cheating (C=36, 60%, pi=.47; C=32, 55%, pi=.40; C=48, 40%, pi=.20)

1. Says he never cheated 40.8
2. Admits he has cheated 22.6
3. Evaded or refused to answer the question 7.6
4. Says cheating is not justified (if not coded 1 or 2) 29.0

N=51

48. Relations with faculty (C=113, 87%, pi=.72; C=3, 80%, pi=.57)
Include relation in any role (teacher, advisor, employer, coach, sponsor, friend, etc.)

1. No relation with faculty outside formal duties	75.0
2. Knows faculty member well enough to speak to him outside the classroom, but doesn't know him personally	16.1
3. Yes, a sustained relationship with one	7.8
4. Yes, with two or more	1.1
	N=102

49. Courtship and marriage status (C= 36, 90%, pi=.87; C=32, 82%, pi=.77; C=48, 60%, pi=.48)

0. Non-dater	7.3
1. Occasional dater (dates only once a month or less)	17.3
2. Regular dater (dates more than once a month)	39.7
3. Going steady or lavaliered	11.7
4. Pinned	6.5
5. Engaged	8.1
6. Married	9.0
	N=116

50. Career and marriage plans of women (C=36, 90%, pi=.85; C=32, 88%, pi=.81; C=48, 85%, pi=.77)

1. Has plans for marriage and career	20.7
2. Has plans for marriage with a career	15.3
3. Has plans for career but no plans for marriage	41.4
4. Has no plans for either marriage or career	22.6
	N=43

51. Plans after graduation (C=97, 80%, pi=.76; C=19, 70%, pi=.69)
Plans students have for the years immediately after they get their bachelor's degree.

1. Graduate school or study abroad	8.1
2. Professional school (law, medicine, theology, social work, etc.)	16.6
3. Job, with the possibility of making it a career	28.1
4. Job, with the intention of continuing education at a later time	15.6
5. Job, with the intention of becoming a housewife after a few years	4.2
6. Military service (but, if it is a career, assign code 3)	6.9
7. Housewife	3.6
9. No clear cut plans	16.9
	N=83

52. Prestige of occupational choice (C=36, 90%, pi=.87; C=32, 80%, pi=.73; C=48, 76%, pi=.68)
Use the same instructions as for variable 20.

1.	40.3
2.	25.5
3.	34.2
	N=93

53. Change in scholarly values (C=116, 68%, pi=.54)
Code changes evident by comparing earliest and latest reports, preferably by comparing attitudes as freshmen and seniors. Applies to change in breadth of scholarly interests. The concept is often referred to as liberal or general education as contrasted with specialized, vocational technical, or professional education.

1. Has broadened his scholarly interests	55.1
2. Unchanged, but was already broad in his interests	10.2

3. Unchanged; has remained narrow 33.4
4. Has become narrower or less broad in his interests 1.3

N=92

54. Change in moral values (C=36, 82%, pi=.76; C=48, 80%, pi=.73; C=32, 75%, pi=.67))
Code changes evident by comparing earliest and latest reports, preferably by comparing attitudes as freshmen and seniors.

1. Has changed his own moral standards and conduct in a more liberal direction, as well as become more tolerant in his attitudes toward the moral conduct of others 31.5
2. Has become more tolerant of moral conduct of others but maintains conservative standards for himself 22.3
3. Unchanged; has always been liberal 30.1
4. Unchanged; has always been conservative 14.3
5. Has become less tolerant in his attitudes or more conservative in his conduct 1.8

N=64

APPENDIX C

TABLES

Table 1. Sample Size, Interviews Completed, and Completion Rate, by Semesters

Interview Schedule and Semester	Students Enrolled from Panel Sample (unweighted)	Interviews Completed	Completion Rate (Percent)
1. Fall '59	116	109	94
2. Spring '60	103	95	92
3. Fall'60	86	69	80
4. Spring '61	82	56	68
5. Fall '62	64	52	81
6. Spring '63	64	54	84

Table 2. Percent of Panel Sample (Weighted) Enrolled by Semesters, by Honor or Regular, and Sex

Semester	Honor	Regular	Men	Women	All Students
1. Fall '59	100	100	100	100	100
2. Spring '60	90	90	88	92	90
3. Fall '60	95	70	70	73	71
4. Spring '61	95	66	63	73	67
5. Fall '61	85	57	62	56	59
6. Spring '62	80	55	62	51	57
7. Fall '62	55	56	61	50	56
8. Spring '63	60	53	57	48	54
N	20	96	63	53	116

Table 3. Status Among Students and Membership in Greek-Letter Societies, Percent

Membership	Status Among Students Leader	 Participant	 Marginal	 All Students
1. Greek	87	34	10	41
2. Independent	13	66	90	59
Total	100	100	100	100
N	18	63	11	92

X^2=21.023 d.f.=2 P<.001 C=.43 (maximum value of C in 3x3 table=.82)

Table 4. Alienation and Attachment Toward the Greek System by Membership in Greek-Letter Societies, Percent

Attitude	Greek	Independent	All Students
1. Alienation	0	67	42
2. Moderate Attachment	55	31	40
3. Strong Attachment	45	2	18
Total	100	100	100
N	39	66	105

X^2=55.373 d.f.=2 P<.001 C=.59

Table 5. "Senior Slump": Last Semester Grade-Point Average in Relation to That of Semester Before the Last of Graduates in Sample, Percent

G.P.A. Before Last	Last Grade-Point Average Lower	 Equal or Higher	Total	N
1. Below 2.50	10	90	100	21
2. 2.50-2.99	15	85	100	13
3. 3.00-3.49	22	78	100	18
4. 3.50-4.00	33	67	100	3

Table 6. Perception of Freshman-Sophomore Advisor as a Person by Honor and Regular Students, Percent

Perception of Advisor	Regular	Honor	All Students
1. Friendly	39	87	42
2. Casual	17	6	16
3. Indifferent or Cold	44	7	42
Total	100	100	100
N	52	15	67

$X^2=25.76$ d.f.=2 $P<.001$ C=.52

Table 7. Perception of Freshman-Sophomore Advisor's Knowledge of Courses and Requirements, Percent

Perception of Advisor	Regular	Honor	All Students
1. Helpful	33	86	37
2. Convenient	44	14	42
3. Harmful	23	0	21
Total	100	100	100
N	50	14	64

$X^2=8.05$ d.f.=2 $P<.02$ C=.33

Table 8. Reaction to Academic Aspect of the Freshman Year by Honor and Regular Students, Percent

Reaction	Regular	Honor	All Students
1. Hard	62	17	59
2. Mixed or Neither	30	76	33
3. Easy	8	7	8
Total	100	100	100
N	86	18	104

$X^2=14.498$ d.f.=2 $P<.001$ C=.35

Table 9. Level of Academic Effort by Honor and Regular Students, Percent

Level of Effort	Regular	Honor	All Students
1. Much Effort	20	37	21
2. Moderate Effort	63	42	62
3. Little Effort	17	21	17
Total	100	100	100
N	80	19	99

$X^2=3.017$ d.f.=2 $P<.30$ C=.17

Table 10. Satisfaction With Grades by Honor and Regular Students, Percent

Satisfaction	Regular	Honor	All Students
1. Very Satisfied	8	28	9
2. Satisfied	35	50	36
3. Dissatisfied	57	22	55
Total	100	100	100
N	80	18	98

$X^2=9.00$ d.f.=2 $P<.02$ C=.28

Table 11. Value of Scholarship by Honor and Regular Students, Percent

Value of Scholarship	Regular	Honor	All Students
1. Strong Scholarly Orientation	19	42	20
2. Somewhat Scholarly	41	37	40
3. Unscholarly	40	21	40
Total	100	100	100
N	83	19	102

$X^2=4.970$ d.f.=2 $P<.30$ C=.26